DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 800 IR 004 869

AUTHOR	Yates, Dudley V.
TITLE	An Analysis of the Bases Used By Library Evaluators in the Accrediting Process of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
PUB DATE	Aug 73
NOTE	230p.; PhD. Florida State University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$12.71 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); *College Libraries; Data Analysis; Data Collection; *Doctoral Theses; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Library Surveys; Questionnaires; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

ABSTRACT

Seventy-seven of ninety library evaluators of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) responded to a 1973 questionnaire to determine: (1) if evaluative criteria used are based with an authority other than SACS; and (2) if certain methods, procedures, and techniques employed by evaluators could be used to construct an ideal evaluator profile. Evaluators considered themselves competent and self-sufficient to evaluate libraries without strict adherence to SACS's standard. They expressed a need, however, for guidance from SACS through quantitative guidelines, check lists, and questionnaires, and have developed their own. A profile was constructed based on procedures used by evaluators. The study concluded that minimal guidance is given to evaluators, and that there is minimal communication between SACS and evaluators. The study recommended the SACS should: (1) produce and distribute publications to evaluators identifying differences between suggestions and recommendations; (2) give first-time evaluators copies of good past reports; (3) assign library evaluators to libraries and not other institutional aspects; and (4) make the library standard modern and flexible, containing normative data and quantitative guidelines. Further research on evaluator competency and other libraries and accreditating associations was recommended. Cover letter, questionnaire, and bibliography are appended. (Author/KP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED140800

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BASES USED BY LIBRARY EVALUATORS IN THE ACCREDITING PROCESS OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dudley V. Yates
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

by
DUDLEY V. YATES

A Dissertation submitted to the School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

John M. Goudeau
Professor directing Dissertation

Ronald Blazek

Persis Emmett Rockwood

Harold Goldstein
Dean, School of Library Science

Copyrighted ©
by Dudley V. Yates
All Rights Reserved
August, 1973

IR004869

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Darlene, Keith and David.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is grateful to many persons whose advice and cooperation contributed greatly to this study. Special gratitude is expressed to the following individuals and groups.

To Dr. John M. Goudeau, my major professor, whose deadlines and kind persistence served as effective motivators.

To the other members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Ron Blazek, Dean Harold Goldstein and Dr. Persis Rockwood for their keen perception and incisive comments that aided immeasurably.

To the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for its help in expediting the work of the writer.

To the library evaluators who were of imminent importance to this study, and without whose cooperation the study would not have been completed.

To my friends and colleagues who were imposed upon time and time again for advice which was always cheerfully given.

To Brian Gillespie who aided immensely with his precise editorial suggestions, and finally to Mrs. Doris Yetka who typed and re-typed numerous corrections and changes graciously and uncomplainingly.

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page
1. Summary of Evaluation Preparation Questions 1, 3, 6, 9, 15, 17. 76
2. Summary--Evaluation Visit Questions 80
3. Summary--Check List Questions 99
4. Communication Gap: SACS-Evaluators 106
5. Professional Librarian Evaluation Benefits to Libraries Evaluated 115
6. Summary of Responses to Question 1 118
7. Summary of Responses to Question 2 119
8. Summary of Responses to Question 3 120
9. Summary of Responses to Question 4 121
10. Summary of Responses to Question 5 122
11. Summary of Responses to Question 6 123
12. Summary of Responses to Question 7 124
13. Summary of Responses to Question 8 125
14. Summary of Responses to Question 9 126
15. Summary of Responses to Question 10 127

16. Summary of Responses to Question 11 128
17. Summary of Responses to Question 12 129
18. Summary of Responses to Question 13 130
19. Summary of Responses to Question 14 131
20. Summary of Responses to Question 15 132
21. Summary of Responses to Question 16 133
22. Summary of Responses to Question 17 134
23. Summary of Responses on SACS Reports 135
24. Summary of Responses on the Majority Opinion . 137
25. Agreement and Disagreement with the SACS Reports on Conditions 3, 10, 16 141
26. Agreement and Disagreement with the Majority Opinion on Conditions 3, 10, 16. . . . 142
27. Interviews 153
28. Cost Comparisons 154
29. Readings 155
30. Physical Facilities 156
31. Library Staff 157
32. Miscellaneous 158

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

DEDICATION ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

Statement of the Problem
Significance of the Problem

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . 19

III. METHODOLOGY. 23

Population and Surveying Procedures
Definitions
Limitations
Research Objectives
Collection of Data

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA. 41

Introduction
Background
General Information
Summary (General Information)
General Information, Section B
Summary (General Information, Section B)
Reports
Summary (Reports)
Techniques
Summary (Techniques)
Benefits

V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 166

Summary
Methodology
Findings
Recommendations and Conclusions
Recommendations for Further Research

APPENDICES

A. Letter to Library Evaluators 184

B. Questionnaire Sent to Library Evaluators . . 187

BIBLIOGRAPHY 193

VITA 197

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study will examine data relevant to the library segment of the accrediting processes of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in order to collect and focus upon the knowledge common to the library evaluation process.

Of the institutions of higher education in the world, only those of the United States, its territories and possessions, are unique in the area of accreditation.[1] No other nation approaches the problem of supervising educational institutions through voluntary accreditation as does the United States.[2] Most other countries have the power of accreditation centered in their government, usually in the ministry of education. These governmental agencies discharge their responsibilities of accreditation through flexible methods of appraisal and inspection coupled with a very rigid control of the budget.[1] Needless to say, the agency which wields strict control of budgetary matters is an absolute authority.

---

[1] Paul L. Dressel, "Accreditation and institutional self-study," The North Central Association Quarterly, XXXXVI, n. 1, (Fall, 1971), 277.

[2] James D. Koerner, "Preserving the status quo: academia's hidden cartel," Change, III, no. 2, (March-April, 1971), 50.

In sharp contrast with those countries that exert direct, powerful control of their educational institutions, the United States has no ministry of education nor does the Federal Government exert any direct control over the institutions of higher education.[2] The governmental control that does exist is lodged in the individual states. States may possess the authority to charter institutions of higher education, but the mere fact of obtaining a charter does not imply that the particular institution has complied with any standards that would insure a quality program. In addition, once the institution is chartered, the states assume no continuing control to maintain whatever quality that existed at the time the charter was granted.[3]

Since the governmental control of higher education is so diffused and because of the various states' avoidance of the responsibility of supervising educational programs, the quality of educational programs varies widely. Accreditation is the procedure devised to combat these potential variations and to maintain acceptable standards.[1]

---

[1] Koerner, "Preserving the status quo," p. 50.

[2] Lloyd E. Blauch, (ed.), Accreditation in higher education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), V.

[3] John Dale Russell, "The accrediting of institutions of higher education," The Journal of Teacher Education, I, n. 2, (June, 1950), 83.

The accrediting agencies in the United States are voluntary organizations which derive their operating income from membership dues. These agencies possess no inherent legal power over their members; in practice, however they do exert a considerable amount of influence.[2] As one critic has observed, the influence exercised by the accrediting agencies is so strong that the potential member faced with the question of becoming accredited has no practical option if it wants to survive.[3] On the other hand, non-membership in an accrediting agency precludes so many vitally important conditions that there is hardly a viable reason for an institution to come into existence without accepting the fact that it must be accredited to exist. For example, non-membership in an accrediting agency means that the institution is not allowed to join the Association of American Colleges or the American Council on Education, its alumnae may not become members of the American Association of University Women, nominations from non-accredited institutions will not be considered for membership in the American Association of University Professors, and students may not transfer academic credit to accredited institutions.[1] Voluntary accreditation, simply, is a prerequisite for higher education in the United States.

---

[1] Russell, "The accrediting of institutions of higher education," p. 83.

[2] Ibid., p. 84.

[3] Koerner, "Preserving the status quo," p. 52.

The function of accreditation, as it is known today, was first implemented by regional associations, most of which were established initially to promote good relations between secondary schools and institutions of higher education, and to improve the latter's admission standards and requirements. Admission to membership, however, was not synonymous with being accredited. These associations began as follows: (1) The New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, established as the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools (1885); (2) The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, organized as the College Association of Pennsylvania (1887) and changed to its present name in 1931; (3) The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (1895); (4) The

---

[1] William K. Selden, *Accreditation; a struggle over standards in higher education* (New York: Harper and Brothers, (1960), pp. 4-5.

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, organized as the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States (1895); (5) The Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools (1917); and (6) The Western College Association, organized as the Southern California Association of Colleges and Universities (1924).[1]

To serve the purpose of this study, attention will be focused upon only one of the six regional accrediting agencies, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and its higher education member institutions that are grouped into the Commission on Colleges. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools hereafter will be referred to as the Southern Association.

The Southern Association encompasses eleven states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. The Southern Association is the second largest regional accrediting agency, the North Central Association being the largest with nineteen states. The Southern Association began functioning as an accrediting agency for institutions of higher education when, in 1917, it created the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. The

---

[1] Blauch, Accreditation in higher education, p. 10.

Commission was charged with the responsibility of preparing a statement of standards that could be applied to member institutions. These standards were to be used also as guidelines to determine the acceptability of any new applicants for membership.[1]

Since its beginning, the work of the Southern Association has increased in size and complexity. In 1949 the central office was established in Atlanta and in 1951, the separate office of Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges and Universities joined the central office, where it is still located.[2]

From this central office in Atlanta, the evaluation team is gathered from anywhere in the eleven state region to meet at a single institution that has prepared for the evaluation visit. The evaluation may begin with a request for an evaluation from an institution which desires membership in the Southern Association, or it may begin with a notification from the Southern Association that the Association is ready to re-evaluate a member institution. There is a preliminary visit by representatives of the Southern Association at which time a date is set for the evaluation team visit. This date is usually at least a year away from the initial visit. The

---

[1] Blauch, Accreditation in higher education, p. 64.

[2] Ibid., p. 64.

institution then begins preparations for the most important segment of the evaluation, the self-study, in which it evaluates its purposes. Also, it seeks to find out if it has been successful in attaining its goals and if not, why not.

Evaluation teams are comprised of as few as five or six members for small colleges, or as many as fifty or sixty members for large multi-purpose universities. Librarians are always members of these teams and there may be as many as three or four librarians on the large teams.

Team members usually receive the institutional self-study, college catalogs, faculty handbooks and other materials several weeks in advance of their visit. After a visit, which is normally completed within three days, a report is forwarded to the Commission on Colleges by the chairman of the evaluation team. The Commission studies this report to determine if the institution should be accredited or re-accredited. The institution undergoing evaluation will be notified by the Commission as to its status, not by the visiting team.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to examine, analyze and classify existing data relative to library evaluations along with additional data that can be collected by a direct-mail questionnaire. The study will extract from the data certain principles and procedures which will form the basis of an efficient, new, standardized approach to the evaluation of libraries. These data will help fulfill specifically the goals of formulating a profile of the ideal evaluator, and determining if the evaluative criteria utilized by evaluators are based with an alternate authority or influence other than those supplied by the Southern Association.

Significance of the Problem

The role of accreditation has been the subject of conflicting opinions since its inception. Its benefits are difficult to prove, and its deficiencies are difficult to document.[1] Although the literature on accreditation is sparse and mostly historical,[2] Koerner, a very vocal critic of accreditation, has provided food for thought when he asks for the abolishment of voluntary accrediting agencies in favor of ones which would operate more publicly.[1] However, Kells thinks that Koerner's argument, however well-intentioned, contains undocumented or dated criticism.[2]

---

[1] "Basic policies for accreditation," Educational Record, LIII, no. 2, (Spring, 1972), 149.

[2] Herbert R. Kells, "Institutional accreditation: new forms of self-study," Educational Record, LIII, no. 2 (Spring, 1972), 143.

Frederick W. Ness, a former president of the Association of American Colleges, stated the dilemma neatly when he said:

> On the one hand, the critics of regional accreditation are many. On the other hand, apart from dismissing accreditation entirely--and some have suggested this--most writers are at a loss to suggest development of something other than the voluntary system we now have.[3]

Stallman predicts that unless accrediting is improved and accepted, the Federal Government will enter the accrediting field.[4] Dickey and Miller think that the Federal Government and accrediting agencies are destined toward mutual involvement especially if the accrediting agencies continue to seek such involvement. Continued involvement would result in a natural adjunct of Federal control, which the accrediting agencies do not want. If, in a move to protect themselves from Federal control, the agencies would disassociate themselves from the Federal Government and fail to serve it, then the agencies would leave themselves open to charges of non-accountability and social irresponsibility.[1] This the agencies do not want either.

---

[1] Koerner, "Preserving the status quo," p. 54.

[2] Kells, "Institutional accreditation," p. 143.

[3] Allan O. Pfnister, "Regional accrediting agencies at the crossroads," Journal of Higher Education, XXXXII, n. 7, (October, 1971), 559.

[4] Esther Stallman, "Accreditation," Drexel Library Quarterly, III, n. 2, (April, 1967), 194.

Stuit[2] and Eckelberry[3] have stated that accreditation is not without its critics, but most would agree that the advantages of accreditation outweigh the disadvantages. However, it must be noted that there is a minority who believe just the opposite. The critics of accreditation range from faculty and alumni to trustees and college presidents and from small, struggling institutions to the large, well established imposing institutions of higher education in the United States.

---

[1] Frank G. Dickey and Jerry W. Miller, "Federal involvement in nongovernmental accreditation," Educational Record, LIII, n. 2, (Spring, 1972), 141.

[2] Dewey B. Stuit, "Accreditation--its problems and its future," Teachers College Record, LXII, n. 8, (May, 1961), 633.

[3] Roscoe H. Eckelberry, "Accreditation in a pluralistic society," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, n. 6, (June, 1960), 344.

Nor are all the critics on the outside looking in; administrators from within accrediting agencies have offered critical suggestions also. For example, Felix Robb, director of the Southern Association asserts that the critics who have written off voluntary accreditation are wrong, although he does not think the Southern Association is able to rest upon its past won laurels.[1] He admits that accreditation, in spite of the good accomplished, is in some disarray, and contends that its problems stem in part from the failure of the various associations to work together closely. He warns that unless accrediting agencies are able to pull themselves together, there is the danger that society will bypass accrediting agencies as viable forces in higher education.[2] While not stated as such, Robb's implication seems to be that ubiquitous threat governmental control.

Another administrator from within the ranks of accrediting agencies, William K. Selden, former executive director of the National Commission on Accrediting, has explored three possible alternatives to accreditation. The first possibility is that colleges and universities need no external check on their activities. Competition would then be the great eliminator; the institutions with quality programs would win all the students and the inadequate institutions would have to close their doors. Selden, however, dismisses this possibility by pointing out that such a proposal lacks an understanding of history and social development, because if the force of accreditation were removed from education, it would create a void that would be filled by the government.[1] For without governmental or voluntary accreditation standing ready with the threat of punitive action, the public would be victimized with inferior schools to a much greater extent than it is today.

---

[1] Felix C. Robb, "Annual report of the director," Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Proceedings, XXIII, n. 9, (July, 1971), 6.

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

The second possibility would be to create, as have most other countries in the world, a ministry of education and to endow it with strict power and authority. Such a drastic change would necessitate a constitutional revision, which in all probability could not be achieved. The third possibility as a replacement to the present voluntary accreditation would be to establish a federal agency and place at its disposal huge amounts of money to be distributed as it deemed necessary. In establishing the criteria for institutions to become recipients of the grants, the federal agency would then become, in effect, an accrediting agency. Only the recipient institutions would be listed in publications by the agency,[1] and the published list would be tantamount to accreditation.

---

[1] William K. Selden, "The place of accreditation in the governance of higher education," Journal of Teacher Education, XV, n. 3, (September, 1964), 264.

Selden, then, sees on one hand the critics who say that accreditation as we know it should be abolished but offer no alternate solutions; on the other hand he sees critics who decry voluntary accreditation and offer up one or more of the above three possibilities. But, he dismisses these three alternatives as being impractical and incapable of being initiated unless higher education would abdicate its accrediting obligations to the civil government. Allowing the government to provide for accreditation would be an admission by higher education that it could not, or no longer wished to, govern its own accrediting policies and procedures. Higher education cannot allow itself to commit such an act of social irresponsibility.[2]

---

[1] Selden, "The place of accreditation in the governance of higher education," p. 265.

[2] Ibid., p. 265

Since, apparently, there are no alternatives to voluntary accreditation, the present system needs to engage in a self-examination and emerge with some internal revisions that would aid it in becoming a stronger, more socially responsible institution.[1] Robb exhorts the Southern Association to become involved in a similar action when he says:

> It is strategically important that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools assess its own role, resources, ability and effectiveness as it seeks to help meet the South's educational needs. In short, we should engage in an evaluation of ourselves, a self-study as comprehensive and penetrating as the very best done in the accreditation process by any member institution.[2]

As the accreditation agencies become introspectively concerned about their roles, there are two basic criticisms that need to be considered. The first criticism is directed toward the failure of any system to evaluate effectively the methods and procedures essential to produce the necessary output of the educational system, the educated individual. Accrediting agencies do not yet know, after many years of searching, what are the component parts that comprise a quality institution, an excellent professional school, or a superior academic department. The second criticism is pointed toward the individuals who perform the evaluations. If the first criticism is valid and evaluations are truly imprecise, the administrators of institutions being judged for accreditation wish that all possible margin of potential error be removed by utilizing the services of evaluators who are wise, comprehending, intelligent and broadly experienced. Since judgment plays such an important part in accreditation and even in the establishing of standards, it is a prime requisite for evaluators.[1]

---

[1] Selden, "The place of accreditation in the governance of higher education," p. 266.

[2] Robb, "Annual report of the director," p. 6.

A critic from without the confines of accrediting agencies is John Dale Russell. High upon Russell's list of criticisms directed toward voluntary accreditation is that of inadequately qualified evaluators. Competent evaluators are difficult to find and this condition is attributable to the fact that well qualified people are too busy with teaching, research and other academic duties; they are, therefore, able to give only a marginal amount of their time and energies to the accrediting process of evaluation.[2]

---

[1] Selden, "The place of accreditation in the governance of higher education," p. 266.

[2] Russell, "The accrediting of institutions of higher education," p. 90.

Moving away from the problems assailing accrediting agencies and accreditation in general and closer to the crux of this study, Pattillo focuses upon the specific problem of library evaluation when he states that "The library is one of the most difficult phases of an institution's program to evaluate adequately."[1] By way of explanation, he continues by saying that in almost every other area of an institution's program the inspecting personnel have a good idea of what to look for and how to draw conclusions. This is not to say that these evaluators have an easy task of it. In general there is agreement on what is important and agreement upon the techniques of data gathering necessary for finding what is important.[2]

Unfortunately, in the area of library evaluation there exists no corpus of knowledge that allows itself to be applicable to all the various libraries. Pattillo contends that there are faults in all methods of determining the effectiveness of a college library, and beyond certain widely accepted tenets there is a paucity of constructive thought as to how to proceed in a specific situation.[3]

---

[1] Manning M. Pattillo, "The appraisal of junior college and college libraries," College and Research Libraries, XVII, (September, 1956), 397.

[2] Ibid., p. 397.

[3] Ibid., p. 397.

As is evident from the above, the process of accrediting has evoked many criticisms. Equally evident, perhaps, is the concern of the accrediting agencies in their search for a new departure. The educational profession has heard from numerous critics, even from those within the accrediting agencies themselves. Some have criticized in a sincere effort to alleviate some of the problems; others have criticized and offered no alternative solutions.

Very few people in higher education are neutral on the subject of accreditation,[1] and it is quite agreed that accreditation is beset by numerous problems.[2] However, of significance to this study are (1) the question of the competence of the evaluator (because this competence to make judgmental decisions is basic to the success of the role the Southern Association has set for itself)[3], and (2) the question concerning the validity of present standards used in the accrediting process.[1]

---

[1] Henry C. Mills, "The effects of accreditation procedures," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, n. 6, (June, 1960), 312.

[2] Stuit, "Accreditation--its problems," p. 633.

[3] Norman Burns, "The task of accrediting in higher education today," North Central Association Quarterly, XXXIV, n. 1, (July, 1959), 233.

A competent library evaluator should have a correct perception of his role,[2] and as we have seen an awareness and command of proven evaluative techniques. If this study is successful in determining that these factors are instrumental in improving the quality of library evaluations, the results could be generalized for use by future library evaluators, librarians of institutions hosting accrediting teams, the Southern Association's Commission on Colleges, and even, perhaps, by other regional accrediting agencies. The Southern Association, in exchange for its cooperation, will be presented the data gathered in this study to use as it deems appropriate.

Since a decision cannot be made on how to improve the quality of an evaluation by looking at the sum of the parts of an institution, it is necessary to study the individual components. Although this paper will explore only one facet of the accreditation evaluation, that of the library, it will perhaps result in an improvement of that single segment, which would be a necessary step toward improvement of the whole.

---

[1] Asa S. Knowles, "A report on institutional accreditation in higher education," North Central Association Quarterly, XXXXV, n. 2, (Fall, 1970), 282.

[2] Stuit, "Accreditation--its problems," p. 630.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Pattillo has reviewed the important changes in the procedures for evaluating college libraries,[1] while this is helpful it still remains, of course, largely historical. He does point out the difficulty that is encountered in attempting evaluations of libraries and cites the need of developing a new approach.[2]

Burns suggests that accrediting agencies strive to remain relevant and flexible through a continuing self-study of their own purposes and procedures, combined with an accommodating stance toward innovative and technological advancements in informational media.[3] Wiggins[4] concurs with Burns recognizing that there are strengths and weaknesses in the process of evaluating libraries. Burns thinks that fewer quantitative standards and more qualitative standards would be a change in the right direction.[1]

---

[1] Pattillo, "The appraisal of junior college and college libraries," p. 397-402.

[2] Ibid., p. 397.

[3] Norman Burns, "Accrediting procedures with special reference to libraries," College and Research Libraries, X, n. 2, (April, 1949), 156-157.

[4] Sam P. Wiggins, "Accreditation and quality assurance," Higher Education in the South (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1966), p. 187-201.

In a survey of techniques used by library evaluators, Gelfand has compiled an extensive list of methods used by library evaluators, plus a more concise table depicting the benefits that evaluators derived from their experiences. The study, although limited to the North Central Association, should be of value when applied to other regional accrediting agencies.[2] Gelfand's study is fairly comprehensive and is unique in that it is the only bit of research uncovered that possesses a direct, useful relationship to the topic of this paper.

Although in 1955, Covey completed a study of the evaluation of certain selected libraries of California teachers' colleges, he focused upon the library's tangible components, such as library materials, staff, building and equipment, use by the academic community and financial support. Because the study was directed toward the physical assets and their effects upon accreditation and because he excluded university libraries and included librarians with no prior evaluation experience, the study has less relevance than is indicated by its title, Evaluation of College Libraries for Accreditation Purposes.[1] However, its comprehensiveness will allow selected portions to be chosen as being supportive to the topic of this paper. For example, the bibliography contains pertinent references and the returns of the survey possess generalizable information.

---

[1] Burns, "Accrediting procedures with special reference," p. 158.

[2] Morris A. Gelfand, "Techniques of library evaluators in the Middle States Association," College and Research Libraries, XIX, (July, 1958), 305-320.

Kells states: "Literature on institutional accreditation is sparse . . .",[2] and literature on the specific subject of the library portion of accreditation is almost nonexistent. For, after a fairly thorough search of the literature, only the above titles were gleaned as being related literature. Therefore, it must be concluded that no body of published literature exists. Selden summed it up when he said: "Of the hundreds and hundreds of volumes written about higher education in the United States it is surprising to note that no more than passing reference, if any at all, is made to accreditation . . . ."[1] So, this study, will be conducted without the benefit of guidelines usually provided by prior research and/or a solid base of existing literature.

---

[1] Alan Dale Covey, "Evaluation of college libraries for accreditation purposes," (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955), p. 1-428.

[2] Kells, "Institutional accreditation," p. 143.

In the area of unpublished literature the library of the Southern Association's central office in Atlanta contains a wealth of materials. Knowles has remarked that "There is probably no greater body of knowledge about all aspects of higher education than that contained in the self-studies and team evaluation reports in the files of the regional accrediting commissions.[2]

---

[1] Selden, Accreditation; a struggle, p. 1.

[2] Knowles, "A report on institutional accreditation," p. 287.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) is composed of four groups, (1) the Commission on Elementary schools, (2) the Commission on Secondary Schools, (3) the Commission on Occupational Education Institutions and (4) the Commission on Colleges. The Commission on Colleges is the group in which more than 600 institutions of higher education have membership.

Each of the 600 plus institutions has one vote in the College Delegate Assembly. In fact each member of the other three commissions has a vote in its own delegate assembly. Each Assembly sets the standards for its own members and determines institutional accreditation of individual institutions in the South. Through the central Commission on Colleges, which is located in Atlanta, the member higher education institutions are responsible for evaluating colleges and universities and recommending actions to the Commission.

The annual Business Meeting decides questions that arise which pertain to matters other than setting of standards and determining accreditation. Each member institution has one vote in the Annual Business Meeting.

The goal of accreditation is improvement. Accreditation is accomplished by meeting the standards as approved by the Commission on Colleges. Essentially these standards are established by the membership; therefore each institution is evaluated by its own peers.

The evaluation process is begun with the self-study. In a complete self-study, which requires a year approximately, the higher education institution determines its own special purpose and goals and attempts to determine if it has been successful in achieving them. After the completion of the self-study, the Visiting Evaluation Committee, of which the library evaluator is a member, is sent by the Commission on Colleges to evaluate the institution in light of its self-study. The Visiting Committee makes recommendations and suggestions to the College Delegate Assembly which determines whether to award accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation, whichever the case may be.

Those institutions acquiring membership in SACS are so indicated in the membership lists which are issued annually by SACS.

SACS accredits an institution on balance; the awarding of accreditation is not a guarantee that each aspect of the institution is of equal quality.[1]

Population and Surveying Procedures

The population studied was composed of all librarians who had made at least one evaluation visit as a representative of the Southern Association during the past five years. The time limitation of five years was imposed in order to assure that the librarians surveyed were reasonably currently active in the evaluative process. The population was defined by a list of evaluators supplied by SACS. This list contained the names of the evaluators, the institution at which they were employed and the name of the institution visited by them. The criteria for selection as a library evaluator are not known but the study explores the selection process.

Of all the librarians in the Southern Association accrediting region only those librarians who had actually performed evaluations for SACS were included in the study. While it is certain that some members of the population had served as evaluators for other types of accrediting agencies including other regional agencies, nevertheless, to be included in this study, it was necessary for the evaluator to have performed an evaluation for SACS. Therefore, the population chosen is unique in that these evaluators possess the knowledge of SACS's evaluative processes.

---

[1] The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools: Atlanta, n. d., n. p.

It was desirous to obtain input from evaluators who are currently active in the SACS's accrediting agency. Therefore, the population chosen had performed one evaluation in the past five years. It is believed that the validity of the study will be enhanced if the population had significant evaluation experience as measured by performing, on the average, three evaluations in the time limit set forth.

At the time of selection the characteristics of the population were not known. The questionnaire, however, contained a section entitled Background that revealed certain characteristics of the group. For example, the Background segment was devised to determine how long and in what type of academic library the librarians had been employed and how many evaluations and in what type of library they had been performed.

Since this survey was mailed in April, 1973, the current year's evaluators were not included in this study. To have done so would have necessitated waiting until the end of calendar year 1973 before mailing the questionnaire. The year 1973 is rather unusual in that more than 120 institutions were up for accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation. The usual average number each year is approximately fifty. Assuming a rate of fifty evaluators per year for five years, the maximum population would be 250 if each evaluator made one visit. In fact, the list of evaluators supplied by SACS indicates a maximum number of ninety evaluators. Since ninety is a manageable number, sampling was discarded and the entire population was surveyed. By surveying the entire population, there should be no significant inaccuracies resulting from an inadequate representation.

The questionnaire was developed by gathering input from personal conferences with librarians and library evaluators, researching pertinent literature and evaluation reports, and through the personal experiences of the researcher in evaluating libraries. The questions and comments which emerged from the foregoing were incorporated into the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was pre-tested by the researcher's major professor and six other librarians. They were requested to point out any ambiguous or imprecise questions, and to comment upon the arrangement and logic of question progression. The researcher interviewed the individuals involved in the pre-testing to ascertain their opinions relative to several questions. The intent of such interviews was to perform a validity check against the questions as worded versus implied meanings as interpreted by the researcher. The pre-test resulted in several changes in the instrument, the completed form of which appears in Appendix B.

The questionnaire, being rather lengthy with 128 numbered items, was designed to be answered with a check mark in the vast majority of instances to conserve the respondent's time.

The first page of the questionnaire gave the purpose and design along with definitions of terms that would be encountered within the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into six parts, (I) Background Information, (II) General Information A and B, (III) Reports, (IV) Techniques, (V) Benefits Derived from Evaluating Libraries and (VI) Comments. The questions ranged from easy to not so easy and the answers ranged from obvious to not so obvious.

The questions that required the most contemplation were spaced throughout the questionnaire so as not to discourage the respondents from completing the survey.

The Background section of the questionnaire was designed to obtain information such as what type of library the respondent had worked in mostly and what type of library he had had the most experience in evaluating. The latter was needed so that it would be possible to divide the respondents into four categories and compare them for any possible significant differences. These categories were (1) large universities, (2) small universities, (3) four year colleges and (4) junior colleges.

Also, information concerning the evaluation experience of each respondent was desired for two reasons. First, the researcher needed to know how much experience each evaluator had in order to discern the validity of the study in general. For example, a group of respondents composed mainly of evaluators who had performed only a single evaluation visit would not lend as much credence to the study as a group which had an average of three visits per evaluator. Secondly, it was necessary to know when the evaluations had been performed so that it could be determined if the population was, in fact, currently active in the evaluation process.

The Background section also served as an introduction to the questionnaire and therefore was designed to ask "you" directed questions. That is, the questions explored the personal side of the respondent with such questions as, "How long have you worked?", "How did you feel on your first visit?", "Do you benefit from an evaluation visit?", etc. These questions attempted to obtain ego involvement of the respondent thereby diminishing any reticence to continue answering the remaining questions.

The sections entitled "General Information" and "General Information, Section B" were, as their titles imply, designed to obtain information of various kinds from the respondents. The difference between the two sections is a matter of degree not of kind. The sections were separated so the questions requiring similar responses were grouped together for the convenience of the respondent.

Primarily, the information gathered from these sections reflected the opinions of the evaluators relative to their perceptions of their roles as evaluators. In addition, the opinions of the respondents relative to the communications between SACS and themselves is revealed. The questions ranged from extremely important to questions that were personally interesting. The latter was included since it was thought that any errors should be of commission rather than omission.

The Reports section was designed to gather data relative to how the evaluators would react to a certain condition if it were encountered on an evaluation visit. These data were analyzed to determine the degree of consistency present in the reporting techniques of the respondents. The data were also analyzed to determine if there were any significant differences among evaluators when they are grouped by types of libraries evaluated. The groups were formed by separating the respondents into one of four categories, (1) large universities, (2) small universities, (3) four year colleges and (4) junior colleges.

In the Techniques section, the purpose was to be able to formulate a list of techniques arranged by order of decreasing frequency that would reveal the most commonly utilized techniques among evaluators. Again the respondents were grouped by types of libraries evaluated to see if there were any significant differences in the employment of techniques.

The Benefits section of the questionnaire was designed to ascertain what benefits accrued to the respondents from evaluating libraries.

The Comment section was simply a blank sheet of paper upon which the respondents were requested to place any comments that could not be placed in the questionnaire because of insufficient space. The respondents were invited and encouraged to make appropriate comments but comments were not required.

At the end of each section of the questionnaire a summary was made. Pertinent, relevant, similar and keyed questions were taken out of sequence and grouped together so as to intensify the focus of analysis. These questions were not grouped together originally because of the desire to disguise their collective implications from the respondents and to allow them to act as validity checks.

Finally, comparisons were made in the Reports section and Techniques section among the evaluators grouped by types of library evaluated. These comparisons sought to determine, for example, if evaluators who consistently evaluate libraries of four year colleges vary significantly from those who evaluate other types.

On April 27, 1973, the questionnaire was mailed along with a large metered, self-addressed envelope and a cover letter. The cover letter identified the researcher, stated the purpose of the study, requested cooperation, assured anonymity, promised copies of the results to those who desired them, and was signed by the researcher and his major professor. See Appendix A.

The initial mailing and one follow-up two weeks later, resulted in seventy-seven (85.56 per cent) returns being received by May 27, 1973.

The high percentage of returns was perhaps attributable to several factors. The questionnaire contained 128 numbered questions and some of the questions had sub-sections. Attempting to collect so much data posed a problem of possibly overwhelming the recipient with a thick sheaf of papers containing time-consuming questions requiring narrative answers. Therefore, the questions were formulated so that they could be answered simply by making a check mark in the vast majority of instances. Thus the quesionnaire was of the check list type. In order not to produce any hesitancy or resistance in the recipient in answering and returning the questionnaire because of its original size of seventeen pages, the questions were typed on extra-large sheets of 12" X 17" paper. These pages were then photo-reduced to become a more manageable size of six $8\frac{1}{2}$" X 11" pages.

The first series of questions which introduced the respondents to the questionnaire proper, was the Background section. These questions were "you" directed questions--questions which got the respondent to telling about himself--a technique commonly employed by members of the selling profession to "soften" a prospective customer.

Respondents were requested and encouraged to make comments within the questionnaire when appropriate, but were not required to do so. An additional sheet of blank paper was enclosed with the questionnaire so those who wished to make comments were not inconvenienced by trying to locate something on which to write.

Efforts were made to apprise the respondents of the purpose of the study both in the cover letter and on the first page of the questionnaire. The researcher identified himself as a doctoral candidate and stated that the data would be used in a doctoral dissertation. The study was legitimatized by having the researcher's major professor sign the cover letter and by stating that SACS had provided the recipient's name and was aware of the study. Of course, a stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed with the cover letter and questionnaire.

It is the researcher's belief that librarians in general and especially those in the South, are prone to share readily any information requested. In this study the librarians of the population numbered fewer than 100. The fact that only the recipients of the questionnaire, a small minority, possessed the unique knowledge necessary to the success of the study was stated in the cover letter. Therefore, one probable reason contributing to the high percentage of returns is that the evaluators knew that with so few of them being surveyed each response was significant.

In producing the cover letter, every effort was made to produce a quality reproduction that most nearly approximated that of an original letter. In fact, an automatic typewriter, an IBM MTST, was secured and its reproduction was compared with Xerox and photo-offset. The latter was decided upon because of the excellent appearance of the letters. The researcher and his major professor actually signed each individual letter in lieu of signing one and duplicating it several times. The inside address was typed completely to coincide exactly with the outside address. When the recipient was known to the researcher, the salutation was on a first name basis along with penned notes on the cover letter.

Summarizing, it is thought that the form and size of the questionnaire, the personal approach of the "you" directed questions, librarians' inclination to help other librarians, the legitimacy of the study, SACS's awareness of the study and the quality of the cover letter all combined to gain a return of 85.56 per cent.

Definitions

1. Accreditation. The process of applying a stamp of approval to an institution, signifying the level of excellence it has attained or indicating that it has been found to be meeting and maintaining announced standards for the educational service to which the accreditation refers.[1]

2. Library evaluators. Librarians chosen by the Southern Association to visit a member institution to evaluate the library and to react with professional expertise to the self-study of the institution's library.

3. Standards. Standard Six of the "Standards of the College Delegate Assembly of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools" pertains to libraries and includes nine illustrations and interpretations ranging from (1) Supplementary Documents to (9) Service.

---

[1] Russell, "The accrediting of institutions," p. 83.

4. Southern Association. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools is the accrediting agency that performs the accreditation process for its member institutions in an eleven-state area comprised of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

5. Commission on Colleges. The Commission is a sub-division of the Southern Association and serves approximately 600 colleges and universities.

6. Senior Group of Commission on Colleges. The group of evaluators who are employed by and primarily evaluate senior colleges and universities.

Limitations

1. Geographically this study is limited to the eleven state area which comprises the regional activities of the Southern Association.

2. The individuals surveyed will be only those librarians who have served on at least one evaluation visit for the Southern Association during the past five years.

3. The library evaluators surveyed will be only those who have performed evaluations primarily in the Senior Group of the Commission on Colleges.

Research Objectives

This study intends to diminish the informational void currently existing in the area of library evaluations for accreditation purposes.

The objective of this research is to answer the following questions:

(1) Are the evaluative criteria utilized by library evaluators based with an alternate authority or influence other than those supplied by the Southern Association?

(2) Are there certain methods, procedures and techniques employed by library evaluators which could be utilized in constructing a profile of an ideal evaluator?

Collection of Data

Some of the basic data for this study was gathered from SACS, from the files of the former Committee on Libraries that SACS commissioned to revise the library standard and from various libraries that have undergone an evaluation visit. Of course the majority of data was gathered from the library evaluators. The data-gathering instrument was a check list questionnaire which was mailed to all evaluators who fit into the parameters of the study. Questions included in the questionnaire were formulated by gathering input from reading the literature, interviewing librarians and library evaluators and through the personal experience of the researcher in evaluating libraries. SACS furnished a list identifying the evaluators. The direct-mail questionnaire was an expedient measure necessitated by the dispersion of the population through the eleven state accrediting region of SACS.

Because there was no sampling in this study, the responses were displayed in numbers and/or percentages. The percentages are especially useful in characterizing the profile of the evaluator and in determining any significant differences among the four groups of evaluators. The groups are divided into those who have primarily evaluated libraries in (1) large universities, (2) small universities, (3) four year colleges and (4) junior colleges.

Certain key questions which have significant relationship to each other are gathered from their respective positions within the questionnaire and are grouped for focus and analysis. In some cases these groupings of responses are tabulated and displayed in tables for emphasis.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The analysis of data is presented in the same format as that of the questionnaire with one exception. The sequence is as follows: 1) Background, 2) General Information, 3) General Information, Section B, 4) Reports, 5) Techniques and 6) Comments. The Comments section instead of being handled separately, has been broken down into individual comments and placed in their appropriate places within the other five sections of the questionnaire.

Each question of each segment will be analyzed in the same order as presented in the questionnaire initially. The quantitative data garnered by each question will be presented in numerical and percentage totals. If a question has elicited a comment from the respondents, then, the pertinent comment has been withdrawn from the Comment section and placed with the proper question. In addition, the researcher has made comments wherever it was deemed necessary for expansion, enlightenment or clarity.

At the end of each section, a summary will be made. At this stage, pertinent, relevant, similar and keyed questions may be taken out of sequence and grouped together so as to intensify the focus of analysis. These questions were not grouped together originally because of the desire to disguise their implications from the respondents and to act as validity checks.

Finally, comparisons will be made among the evaluators grouped by the type of library evaluated. These comparisons will seek to determine, for example, if evaluators who consistently evaluate libraries of four year colleges vary significantly from those who evaluate mostly university libraries.

Background

In analyzing the background of the respondents, it is indicated that the greatest number of respondents, thirty-eight of seventy-seven (49.35 per cent) had spent the majority of their professional careers in libraries of four year colleges. Twenty-one (27.27 per cent) had worked, for the most part, in large universities; three (3.9 per cent) had worked in special libraries. Only two (2.6 per cent) had been employed in junior colleges for the largest part of their careers.

In response to question number two, "The majority of my evaluations have been in," the break down is as follows: forty-four (57.14 per cent) had primarily evaluated four year colleges; fourteen (18.18 per cent) had evaluated libraries in small universities. Ten (12.99 per cent) performed evaluations in junior colleges; eight (10.39 per cent) had evaluated large universities, and only one (1.3 per cent) had performed evaluations of special libraries.

Since SACS does not usually utilize junior college library personnel to evaluate senior college and university libraries, what could be construed as an inconsistency should be pointed out. While, in fact, two (2.6 per cent) of the respondents had answered that they had served in junior colleges for the majority of their careers, one was employed in two different junior colleges which had later acquired four year status. The other respondent had transferred within the last five years to a four year institution after lengthy service in junior colleges.

Of course, there is no inconsistency in the fact that ten (12.99 per cent) respondents had performed the majority of their evaluations in junior colleges. Obviously personnel from the senior college and university groups may be called upon to evaluate junior colleges; the reverse is not true.

In reply to question number three, "Number of evaluations performed during the past five years," six (7.79 per cent) had performed only one evaluation; fourteen (18.18 per cent) performed two; fifteen (19.48 per cent) had performed three, and ten (12.99 per cent) had performed four evaluations. Fifteen (19.48 per cent) of the respondents had performed five evaluations and seventeen (22.08 per cent) had performed more than five.

The validity of the study is enhanced by the fact that seventy-two (92.21 per cent) of the respondents had performed two or more evaluations. In fact, each respondent averaged 3.8 evaluations even if the seventeen responses in the "More than five" category are interpreted to mean only six. Evidently the population has a strong background in evaluation experience.

The answers to question number four, "I have performed evaluations in the following years," reveal that forty-nine evaluators had performed evaluations in 1972, fifty-two in 1971, forty-eight in 1970, forty-four in 1969, and thirty-nine in 1968. This indicates the librarians comprising the study's universe are currently active in library evaluating, having performed most of their evaluations within the last three consecutive years, 1972, 1971, 1970.

Sixty-five (84.42 per cent) answered negatively question number five, "Have you ever worked as an evaluator with one or more additional library evaluators?" Eleven (14.29 per cent) had worked with additional personnel. Of the eleven, nine had worked with one additional evaluator and the remaining two respondents had worked as a member of a committee of three library evaluators. It should be noted that only the libraries of large, multi-faceted universities require two or more evaluators. However, one respondent commented that he had served on a committee of two in evaluating a special library. Further research revealed that this particular special library was a part of a large university system.

Question number six--"Do you know of any criteria that must be met in order to become an evaluator?"--shows that sixty-two (80.52 per cent) do not know of any criteria that must be satisfied to become an evaluator. Fifteen (19.48 per cent) stated that they were aware of criteria but only one commented on a criterion. He stated that "One must have the recommendation of a respected SACS evaluator before he is invited to evaluate libraries."

Responding to question number seven -- "How would you describe your thoughts on preparation for your very first evaluation visit?"--thirteen (16.88 per cent) said they were ill-prepared. Thirty-seven (48.05 per cent) thought they were only moderately prepared while twenty-three (29.87 per cent) thought they were well prepared. Only two people out of seventy-five who responded to this particular question thought they were excellently prepared for their first evaluation visit. One gave as his reason for believing that he had excellent preparation the fact that he had attended a SACS - sponsored workshop for library evaluators. The other offered no statement as to why he thought his preparation was excellent. Two (2.6 per cent) did not respond to the question.

Seventy-one (92.21 per cent) in answer to question number eight--"Do you benefit professionally from serving as a visiting library evaluator?"--said yes, while one (1.3 per cent) said no. Two (2.6 per cent) other evaluators had no opinion and three (3.9 per cent) did not respond.

The library evaluators who comprise the population of this study are strongly grounded in evaluation experience. Those who have performed at least two evaluations in the past five years, exceed ninety per cent of the respondents. Further, the librarians have performed, on the average, 3.8 evaluations from 1968-1972, the time limits of the study. Perhaps it should be noted that the

3.8 average is conservative because the "more than five" category in the question was interpreted as meaning only six. In addition, most of the evaluations performed by this group occurred during 1970, 1971, and 1972. Therefore, the study has focused upon and is enhanced by the fact that the librarians under scrutiny are experienced library evaluators who are currently active in the evaluating processes. The population is uniquely qualified to express its opinions and viewpoints regarding the evaluative processes and techniques.

The background of the respondents reveals that the majority's professional experience has been in senior colleges. Correspondingly, the majority of evaluations has been performed in senior colleges. This is not surprising since, within the SACS's accrediting region, the four year colleges clearly outnumber the junior colleges or the universities.

In the vast majority of cases the evaluators are the sole members of the committee assigned to evaluate the library; hence they become the chairmen. A few of the librarians have worked with committees which have two or three members. However, this only occurs on visits to large, multi-faceted universities.

It may be unfortunate for an institution to draw a library evaluator on his first evaluation visit. For, by their own admissions, most evaluators felt that they were moderately or ill-prepared to perform their initial visit. Only two respondents thought that they had excellent preparation.

Finally, the average evaluator is convinced that he has benefited professionally from serving as a library evaluator.

General Information

In this section each question gave a choice of five answers. The respondent could answer by checking one of the following: strongly agree, slightly agree, no opinion, slightly disagree, or strongly disagree.

Question number one, "It is admirable that SACS relies on qualitative and individual approaches to a library evaluation rather than an approach based upon strict adherence to Standard Six," was answered in the following manner. Thirty-seven (48.05 per cent) strongly agreed, twenty-six (33.77 per cent) slightly agreed; two (2.6 per cent) had no opinion; seven (9.09 per cent) slightly disagreed and five (6.49 per cent) strongly disagreed.

One respondent made the comment "Strict adherence to Standard Six includes qualitative and individual approaches." Another stated:

> I have always been disturbed by the fact that SACS encourages the interjection of what in fact must be subjective opinion. This means that schools are unevenly rated, depending on the background and experience of the various evaluators; some are stronger than others, some are harder to satisfy than others. Too, an evaluator will change his opinions and ratings from visit to visit, depending in part on the problems to which he may be most sensitive at a given moment in his home environment, or to new information which he has himself gained. The stricter standard and the tighter the means of interpretation, the better or the fairer with an institution any evaluator inevitably will be.

Question number two, "It is possible to evaluate a library's collection and staff in a visit of two to three day's duration," elicited the following responses. Thirty-two (41.56 per cent) strongly agreed; thirty (38.96 per cent) slightly agreed; one (1.3 per cent) had no opinion, with eleven (14.29 per cent) slightly disagreeing and three (3.9 per cent) strongly disagreeing.

Several of the comments to question two were brief sentences stating essentially the same idea such as "depends upon the situation," "depends upon the overall situation," "depends upon the type of institution," etc. Others were a bit more detailed, for example one said:

> I agree that the basic task would be impossible if the visit were all we had to rely upon. However, one must know what he is looking for prior to arrival--that should be accomplished through reading the self-study document. If the document is not revealing enough to give the evaluator a pretty good agenda for the actual visit then I feel it isn't well done. It should tell you what to look for. Then the visit can be worthwhile and something can be accomplished.

Another evaluator said that he had been in the role of the host librarian undergoing an evaluation visit and the visiting evaluator admitted that to evaluate a staff and collection in 2.5 days is "an impossible achievement." They both agreed that it could be possible to attain such an achievement in a very small library, but that it would be impossible in a library of "any appreciable size."

The final comment stated that an in-depth evaluation obviously could not be made in so short a time, but that techniques can and should be developed that would enable evaluators to determine the relative adequacy of a library's collection in 2.5 days.

Question number three stated: "Standard Six attempts to cover all types of academic libraries, private, public, denominational, junior colleges, commuter colleges, small universities, and large universities. Standards should be written to take into account such obvious differences among such varied institutional libraries." Thirty (38.96 per cent) strongly agreed; twenty-four (31.17 per cent) slightly agreed; three (3.9 per cent) had no opinion; ten (12.99 per cent) slightly disagreed and ten (12.99 per cent) strongly disagreed.

With a total of only twenty (25.98 per cent) disagreeing, it is evident that the evaluators think that Standard Six is too broad and general and specificity would be welcome. In answer to question number one, which in essence states that SACS is flexible and does not expect each library to be judged with a strict application of Standard Six, a total of sixty-three evaluators (81.82 per cent) agreed, thirty-seven strongly and twenty-six slightly. This overwhelming majority, coupled with the total of fifty-four (70.13 per cent) agreeing with question three, indicates that evaluators are left to their own individual approaches to the evaluation assignments. In lieu of quantitative standards, evaluators are free to apply undefined qualitative standards. Evaluators have indicated by their response to question three that they would welcome a standard that would take into account obvious differences among libraries. This is summed up rather well by the respondent who commented, "The stricter the standard and the tighter the means of interpretation, the better or the fairer with an institution any evaluator inevitably will be."

On question number four, forty-two (54.44 per cent) strongly agreed and twenty-seven (35.06 per cent) slightly agreed that "A library evaluator often acts as a catalyst to speed up a segment of the host library's program by using the leverage inherent in the authority of the accrediting agency." Two (2.6 per cent) had no opinion and three (3.9 per cent) slightly disagreed. There was no one who strongly disagreed. This is the only question in this segment that drew no responses in the "strongly disagree" category. Three (3.9 per cent) failed to make a response.

With such a preponderance of the population responding in the "strongly agree" and "slightly agree" categories, it appears that the majority of library evaluators often react in a benevolent and sympathetic manner to the host library's situation. By often acting in a helpful fashion, it could be concluded that library evaluators perform their assignments in a positive rather than negative manner. SACS requests its evaluators not to equate their role as evaluator to that of inspector, and obviously such an interpretation is not made.

Question number five was: "There are absolutely no library standards in the United States applicable to university libraries." Seven (9.09 per cent) strongly agreed with the statement; twelve (15.58 per cent) slightly agreed; fifteen (19.48 per cent) had no opinion; twenty (25.97 per cent) slightly disagreed; twenty (25.97 per cent) strongly disagreed and three (3.9 per cent) made no response.

One respondent while agreeing that there are not any university library standards commented that there are several library standards which are usable as guidelines for comparison purposes, such as the Clapp-Jordan Formula, the Washington Formula, and the California Formula. He added that these should be considered only as minimal guideposts and each institution should be judged according to its own needs. Another said that if there were not any university library standards then "we are in sad shape." The final comment asserted that the question was "Difficult to answer because you have not defined standards nor degree of applicability."

When queried as to their thoughts concerning question number six which read, "Apparently, the process leading to accreditation is of immense benefit to the library of the institution concerned," forty-eight (62.34 per cent) strongly agreed and twenty-one (27.27 percent) slightly agreed. In addition, two (2.6 per cent) had no opinion, three (3.9 per cent) slightly disagreed; only one (1.3 per cent) disagreed strongly. Of the two (2.6 per cent) who did not respond to the question, one gave as his reason the researcher's ommission of the definition of the word "benefit." Another who disagreed with the statement, commented that "The accreditation process is valuable in some cases, not as much so in others."

> The value of the accreditation process depends on such factors as the degree of involvement of the faculty and staff of the library. In an instance where a school is blasé, the self-study accomplishes little if anything. This is especially true if the procedure is kept the activity of a limited number, particularly at the administrative level; the learning and self-analysis value is obviously excluded.

It is evident from the responses that almost every evaluator is convinced that the self-study is of vital importance to the library.

Assuming it would be difficult to measure the adequacy of a library collection in a few days, the following question was posed to determine whether evaluators would be receptive to the idea of sampling the collection: "The evaluating tools presently employed by librarians to measure the adequacy of collections are either too costly in time, which is money, or they measure imperfectly. A possible solution, which would be of benefit to library evaluators, would be to apply the sampling technique to measure the adequacy of collections." Only thirteen (16.88 per cent) agreed strongly with the statement; the majority, forty (51.95 per cent), slightly agreed; ten (12.99 per cent) had no opinion; six (7.79 per cent) slightly disagreed; four (5.19 per cent) strongly disagreed and four (5.19 per cent) failed to respond. One of the ten who had no opinion asserted that the question was "poor"; another indicated that he did not understand the question. It should be noted, however, that the question survived the pre-test unchallenged. Another respondent, while not stating as much, seemed not to understand the question as evidenced by his comment: "A certain amount of sampling is used by most schools anyway, and with varying degrees of rigor to be sure." The question was not directed toward determining whether schools employed random samples of collections but rather toward determining whether library evaluators, while performing evaluations, would be able to obtain a clearer idea of the relative adequacy of a collection through random sampling.

A fourth comment was that regardless of the methods employed it would necessitate involving to some extent experienced individuals and it was therefore going to be expensive. However, library evaluators are experienced individuals and their pay ($50.00) precludes their being expensive. The two final comments were: "This is really what we do now," and "Sampling would only serve well as an evaluating tool if done with a high degree of expertise." It is rather evident from the comments that this question generated a certain amount of confusion and misunderstanding. This situation could be attributable to a lack of knowledge about the sampling technique by certain members of the population.

Question number eight asked the respondent if "As a library evaluator you are more concerned with the educational effectiveness of the library rather than its operational efficiency." Twenty-seven (35.06 per cent) strongly agreed; twenty-six (33.77 per cent) slightly agreed; two (2.6 per cent) had no opinion; thirteen (16.88 per cent) slightly disagreed; five (6.49 per cent) strongly disagreed and four (5.19 per cent) failed to respond. Eight respondents chose to make comments regarding this question and all eight were essentially the same. Five of the comments were: "Both are equally important"; "Both are very important, and inefficiency in one of these areas may affect the efficiency in the other area"; "Both are linked together"; "Both are necessary--can't have one without the other"; and "Both are so intertwined that they cannot be separated." The final three comments, though worded a little differently, reflected the thoughts expressed by the others. These comments were: "I think the educational effectiveness depends to a great degree on the operational efficiency"; "It is difficult if not impossible to separate the two"; and "Operational efficiency is one good measure of educational effectiveness."

The committee[1] which formulated the present library standards thought that the most important evidence of a library's effectiveness is the nature and extent of use of the library by the academic community. Thereby one would think of the library as being educationally effective if the faculty and students were using its services frequently and extensively. The question was intended to imply that there are examples where a library is a smooth-running, well managed organizational unit, staffed with properly qualified personnel but is unable to relate meaningfully to the goals and purposes of the institution of which it is a part. In other words, a library could be organizationally sound and operationally efficient, but, could be so out of touch with the curricula that it is acquiring library materials that are not relevant to the educational purposes of the institution. In such a case, it would not matter how quickly and inexpensively the Technical Processes Department could order, catalog, process and place on the shelves a particular title, if that title should not have been chosen for inclusion in the collection. No matter how proper the flow charts, no matter how quickly the Circulation Department is able to charge a student's books, no matter how accessible the library personnel are, unless the academic community makes extensive use of such a library, it is not educationally effective. The majority of the evaluators who responded agreed with the idea as set forth by the SACS Library Committee on Revision of Standards.

---

[1] Letter from the correspondence files of the SACS Library Committee on Revision of Standards.

One of the most important questions in the entire survey was number nine. It read as follows: "In view of the fact that each individual library should be examined or evaluated with an eye toward the parent institution's goals, purposes, curriculum and faculty, would you agree that SACS's Standard Six is at best a point of departure for an evaluation that is based more in the individual evaluator's background of experience and professional training than in the standards themselves?" A total of fifty-nine persons agreed with the question; thirty (38.96 per cent) agreed strongly and twenty-nine (37.66 per cent) agreed slightly. Five (6.49 per cent) stated that they had no opinion; eleven (14.29 per cent) disagreed slightly and only two (2.6 per cent) disagreed strongly.

There were only two who chose to make a comment relative to question nine. One stated rather succinctly, "It is difficult not to base evaluations on one's own experience, but I try not to." The other said:

> I don't really agree with this although I will admit that it has a lot of truth to it. One has to try to be objective and see the library as the institution being examined sees it and evaluate that perception rather than one's own perception. For that reason one must always attempt to gain and use the entire committee's perceptions and not rely exclusively on one's own.

From the above responses it is evident that the evaluators consider themselves self-sufficient and competent to evaluate libraries without maintaining strict adherence to Standard Six. The implication is that the libraries are so varied it is difficult to apply the standard absolutely in each case. Therefore, Standard Six which is the authority for performing the evaluation, is used primarily as a point of departure to perform an evaluation that is tailored more to the concepts and training of the individual evaluators.

Such evidence could be construed as an indictment against SACS, if it were believed to be occurring without the Association's knowledge. This is unlikely. However, it does reveal that SACS, while giving lip service to strict application of Standard Six, allows flexible and individual evaluations of libraries. Additional evidence lies in the fact that the respondents in this study have performed, on the average, 3.8 evaluations. Thus evaluators are repeatedly requested by SACS to make evaluation visits. This, coupled with the fact that sixty-nine (89.61 per cent) respondents have never received from SACS any analysis or criticism of their reports, can lead to only one conclusion. The evaluators are performing their evaluations with the tacit approval of SACS.

In response to question number ten, forty (51.95 per cent) of the respondents agreed strongly that "It would help an inexperienced evaluator to observe at least one evaluation before being assigned to a visiting evaluation committee." Twenty-one (27.27 per cent) slightly agreed; four (5.19 per cent) voiced no opinion; seven (9.09 per cent) slightly disagreed and only five (6.49 per cent) strongly disagreed.

One evaluator added the phrase "Or at least some type of work shop by SACS" as a comment. Similarly the only other comment was that it would be even better to have unexperienced evaluators-to-be attend a training work shop and have the opportunity to read and study reports of previous committees.

Question eleven was intended to explore the thoughts of evaluators concerning the unquestioned leaders among colleges and universities and their relationship to an accrediting agency. For example, some universities grudgingly comply with the accrediting agency's stipulation they undertake a self-study every decade while openly complaining that such activities are a monumental waste of time. The reason projected for such an attitude is that a nationally recognized institution is a pacesetter and hardly can be evaluated by standards that sweep with so broad a brush. In other words, standards that apply to small junior colleges could hardly be used to evaluate a Harvard, a Johns Hopkins, or a UNC at Chapel Hill. In fact, some schools have eschewed membership in an accrediting agency, apparently with no untoward effects.

The question (number eleven) which was formulated to explore this facet of the accrediting process was worded thusly: "Libraries of large, well established institutions which are not dependent upon accreditation (they have an unquestioned reputation for academic excellence) derive their sole benefits from the total review and focusing of effort which is provided in the self-study." Of the seventy-seven respondents, seventeen (22.08 per cent) strongly agreed that standards were essentially meaningless to such libraries. Twenty-six (33.77 per cent) slightly agreed and eleven (14.29 per cent) had no opinion. There were only five (6.49 per cent) who strongly disagreed, seventeen (22.08 per cent) who slightly disagreed and one (1.3 per cent) who failed to respond.

It would appear to be safe to assume that the evaluators think that institutions possessing unblemished academic reputations do not benefit from that facet of the evaluative process, the committee visit.

Only one respondent chose to make a comment regarding question eleven. His comment? "I don't understand the question."

Question number twelve, "Evaluators need better guidance in the form of quantitative guidelines, check lists, and/or questionnaires," was designed to elicit the evaluators' ideas relative to positive forces of uniformity that could be exerted by SACS. Uniformity, in this instance, refers to a more uniform approach by evaluators and does not imply that there should be uniformity among libraries.

In responding to this question, seventeen (22.08 per cent) strongly agreed; twenty-six (33.77 per cent) slightly agreed; three (3.9 per cent) had no opinion; seventeen (22.08 per cent) slightly disagreed; twelve (15.58 per cent) strongly disagreed and there were no responses from two (2.6 per cent).

One of the respondents said that he strongly supported the possibility of utilizing quantitative guidelines but did not think that check lists would be beneficial. Another suggested that library evaluators should meet and discuss the feasibility of formulating either guidelines, check lists, or questionnaires. The final comment was:

> This is where SACS would have to differentiate between types of libraries and levels of programs if check lists were used. I think the use of check lists, etc. cannot be standardized, but must be tailored to the particular institution. I use check lists which I prepare on the bases of the self-study document, the college catalog, and whatever other materials I have that may lend themselves to that. The point is, the check list is peculiar to the institution.

The last sentence of the above comment is a point well taken. Indeed, one check list to apply to all institutions would create an untenable situation. It would be the same as attempting to apply one standard to the approximately 600 institutions within SACS's membership.

A rather sensitive point among librarians was broached in question number thirteen in the following manner: "When SACS revises Standard Six, a statement requiring institutions to grant full faculty status to professional librarians should be included." Thirty-seven (48.05 per cent) strongly agreed; twenty-three (29.87 per cent) slightly agreed for a total of sixty (77.92 per cent) agreeing in varying degrees. Of the other respondents, five (6.49 per cent) had no opinion and twelve (15.58 per cent) divided themselves equally between strongly disagreeing and slightly disagreeing with six (7.79 per cent) each.

Personnel at SACS have indicated that librarians are prone to incorporate into their reports suggestions and/or recommendations relative to the host library staff's not having faculty status. Standard Six does not require institutions, as a condition of their accreditation, to grant faculty status to librarians. Although, according to the evaluation reports received at SACS and the answers to question number thirteen, it would seem that the evaluators very definitely think that their colleagues should be accorded faculty status as a condition of accreditation.

The majority's opinion notwithstanding, one respondent commented:

> It is becoming increasing [sic] apparent to me that faculty rank is apt to do librarians more harm than good. If by faculty status is meant such faculty perquisites as tenure, TIAA and related fringe benefits, then these should be included, with the proviso that access to them is based on criteria unique to and dependent upon the needs and characteristics of librarianship, not teaching. (Too often librarians, zealous in their demands for faculty rank and status, forget that they are not teaching faculty and cannot measure up to the criteria applied to such faculty. To demand equality without qualification is to hoist one's self on one's own petard.)

> Others were a bit more succinct in their comments.
>
> While this is important, other items need more emphasis.
>
> I just don't know whether SACS has the right or power to do this.
>
> At least stronger emphasis should be placed on professional status of librarians.
>
> Some institutions do not have faculty status for any of their faculty, so this mandate would not be logical.
>
> I have been interpreting Standard Five (Faculty) to cover this.

The last comment regarding Standard Five (Faculty) is not clearly understood for two reasons. One, library evaluators are always requested to serve on Standard Six (Library) and sometimes are given double assignments. However, this double assignment is not given with the assumption that both standards will be applied to the library. For example, if an evaluator were assigned to Standard Five and the librarians of that particular institution did not have faculty rank and status, then Standard Five would not encompass the librarians. Two, Standard Five does not even obliquely approach the question of faculty status for librarians.

A library director of a large university, with a student population of over 20,000, stated that he hardly ever made any suggestions in his evaluation reports and often wondered if other evaluators operated in the same vein. This comment prompted the researcher to incorporate such a statement into the questionnaire. The director's opinion was stated in question fourteen thusly: "Due to the fact that suggestions made by the library evaluator may be ignored entirely, it would be proper to eliminate them from the report and rely solely upon recommendations."

According to the responses gathered, the elimination of suggestions from evaluation reports is definitely not trend-setting. Only four (5.19 per cent) agreed strongly; seven (9.09 per cent) agreed slightly. There was no one who was indecisive about this statement because the "no opinion" category was not checked once. However, fifteen (19.48 per cent) slightly disagreed and an overwhelming majority of fifty-one (66.23 per cent) strongly disagreed. It is rather evident, therefore, that evaluators think that suggestions serve a worthwhile purpose. Five of the respondents made comments supporting the use of suggestions:

> Suggestions may be very helpful.
>
> This is sometimes an opportunity for an evaluator's best contribution.

> Suggestions are of considerable value to both the librarian and the administrator interested in improving library services.
>
> If the library has to compete with the Counseling Department or the Physical Education Department for an additional clerk, a suggestion by the evaluating team does give the librarian an outside reinforcement.

Question number fifteen, "The truly important work has been accomplished through the institution's self-study," drew the following responses. Twenty-one (27.27 per cent) respondents agreed strongly with the statement, while thirty-four (44.16 per cent) agreed slightly; sixteen (20.78 per cent) slightly disagreed; five (6.49 per cent) strongly disagreed and one (1.3 per cent) failed to respond. Since the self-study takes place over a time span of twelve months or more, the answers indicate that surely the self-study accomplished in a year can hardly compare in importance to a two-and-a-half-day evaluation visit.

The comments to question fifteen were as follows:

> Depends on the self-study. Could be too perfunctory.
>
> With some qualifications. Would not be so without anticipation of a visiting committee.
>
> The self-study is important, but the follow-up actions to the self-study are equally important.

> Truly important work is also accomplished during the accreditation team's visit.
>
> The self-study is very revealing, if done properly and free from intimidation, but the "force" of a recommendation upon the administration is the ultimate goal.

Question sixteen revealed a major flaw in the thinking of library evaluators. An overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that evaluators believe that their task is to evaluate the library itself rather than the library's self-study. However, in all probability, the blame cannot be placed totally on the evaluators but, to a certain degree, upon SACS for not properly instructing evaluators. This is not to state that the evaluators are blameless, for meticulous preparation including careful perusal of the materials furnished by SACS, would have revealed the proper answer at which question sixteen was directed. Question sixteen said, "The role of the evaluator is to react to and evaluate the library's self-study, not the library." Ten (12.99 per cent) of the respondents agreed strongly; five (6.49 per cent) slightly agreed and two (2.6 per cent) had no opinion. The incriminating answers showed twenty-nine (37.66 per cent) slightly disagreeing, thirty (38.96 per cent) strongly disagreeing, and one (1.3 per cent) not responding.

The view of SACS toward the visiting committee is revealed in Manual for the Institutional Self-Study Program of the Commission on Colleges.

> The visiting committee, as representatives of the Commission on Colleges, will evaluate the completeness and thoroughness of the self-study and present outsiders' viewpoints concerning the findings reported in the study. In this function committee members are educational consultants with a somewhat more objective approach to the institution than can be taken by those immediately involved.[1]

An overwhelming majority of respondents agreed with question number seventeen: "The most important facet of the evaluative process is that it compels the library to consider the very reasons for its existence. Thus, the evaluative process will aid in bringing the library's purposes clearly into line with the overall objectives of the institution of which it is a part." Thirty-four (44.16 per cent) strongly agreed; thirty-one (40.26 per cent) slightly agreed; only one (1.3 per cent) had no opinion. In addition, eight (10.39 per cent) slightly disagreed and three (3.9 per cent) strongly disagreed.

---

[1] Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Manual for the Institutional Self-Study Program of the Commission on Colleges. 1972, p. 42.

The single comment was, "I don't believe this happens frequently." The person who made that comment obviously was in a minority. It is difficult to conceptualize a library that continues to exist over a long period of time if its purposes and goals are contrary to those of the institution. A good academic library's stock-in-trade is a complete identification with its own institution. In fact, one important measuring device for an academic library's excellence is to determine how far its library resources and service go in support of the institution's objectives. A majority of the respondents clearly believed that the evaluative process aids in allowing the institution and the library to seek compatible goals.

In response to question number eighteen, twelve (15. 58 per cent) strongly agreed that "Other members of an evaluation team sometimes do not completely understand the library evaluator's point of view." Forty-two (54. 55 per cent) slightly agreed with the question; six (7. 79 per cent) had no opinion; ten (12. 99 per cent) slightly disagreed and seven (9. 09 per cent) strongly disagreed.

"Library evaluators, and other evaluators for that matter, are said to be poorly paid consultants" was question number nineteen. The answers indicate that nineteen (24.68 per cent) strongly agreed and eighteen (23.38 per cent) slightly agreed. A rather large number, twenty (25.97 per cent), voiced no opinion; six (7.79 per cent) slightly disagreed and fourteen (18.18 per cent) strongly disagreed.

The two comments relating to question nineteen were: "I do not know if this is said," and, "But this is a function of a professional." It would appear that the latter comment sums up the situation, for SACS suggests that evaluators are, in fact, educational consultants and the honorarium is $50.00. However, as will be proved later on in this study, the majority of evaluators think that the fee is unimportant. Even though one can be poorly compensated for his time in monetary gains, it does not negate his enthusiasm for performing the assigned evaluation visits.

The next question, number twenty, "A library evaluator should be a member of each visiting evaluation team," polled some interesting responses. A surprisingly small number, twenty (25.97 per cent) agreed strongly and eighteen (23.38 per cent) slightly agreed. There were twenty (25.97 per cent) who indicated that they had no opinion. Six (7.79 per cent) slightly disagreed and thirteen (16.88 per cent) strongly disagreed.

The comments were: "Insofar as the total institution is concerned" and, "It depends upon the size and nature of the institution."

In established institutions it would be next to impossible to have a non-librarian to serve as the library evaluator. In newly emerging institutions it could be conceivable. However, even the youngest of institutions usually has a library. In fact, one of the first acts of the president of a new institution is to hire a librarian and to fashion a library of sorts. A visiting team of evaluators, therefore, at any stage of development of an institution, would encounter a library of some kind. It is interesting to ponder who would function in the capacity of library evaluator if it were not a librarian. In answer to this, it should be pointed out that many librarians have been called upon to evaluate other aspects of a university's program. Perhaps the reverse could be true.

The last question of this section, number twenty-one was stated in the following manner: "Standard Six is, in fact, unenforceable because it does not contain adequate normative data to guide the library evaluator." Only ten (12.99 per cent) of the respondents agreed strongly with the statement while fourteen (18.18 per cent) agreed slightly with three (3.9 per cent) holding no opinion. Twenty (25.97 per cent) slightly disagreed and thirty (38.96 per cent) respondents strongly disagreed.

Only one respondent chose to comment about question number twenty-one, and he said, "But enforcement may not be the chief benefit of evaluation."

Since as the responses to question number nine indicate, Standard Six is at best a point of departure for an evaluation that is based more in the individual evaluator's background of experience and professional training than in the standards themselves, it is not surprising to note that the majority disagrees that lack of normative data is in any way a hindrance to effective evaluations.

Summary

The evaluators' essential views are revealed by analyzing the responses generated by six specific questions in the above section. The six questions are listed below and the responses are illustrated in Table 1.

(1) It is admirable that SACS relies on qualitative and individual approaches to a library evaluation rather than an approach based upon strict adherence to Standard Six.

(3) Standard Six attempts to cover all types of academic libraries, private, public, denominational, junior colleges, commuter colleges, small universities, and large universities. Standards should be written to take into account such obvious differences among such varied institutional libraries.

(6) Apparently, the process leading to accreditation is of immense benefit to the library of the institution concerned.

(9) In view of the fact that each individual library should be examined or evaluated with an eye toward the parent institution's goals, purposes, curriculum and faculty, would you agree that SACS's Standard Six is at best a point of departure for an evaluation that is based more in the individual evaluator's background of experience and professional training than in the standards themselves.

(15) The truly important work has been accomplished through the institution's self-study.

(17) The most important facet of the evaluative process is that it compels the library to consider the very reasons for its existence. Thus the evaluative process will aid in bringing the library's purposes clearly into line with the overall objectives of the institution of which it is a part.

Question	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	No Opinion	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response	Total
1	37 48.05%	26 33.77%	2 2.6%	7 9.09%	5 6.49%		77 100%
3	30 38.96%	24 31.17%	3 3.9%	10 12.99%	10 12.99%		77 100%
6	48 62.34%	21 27.27%	2 2.6%	3 3.9%	1 1.3%	2 2.6%	77 100%
9	30 38.96%	29 37.66%	5 6.49%	11 14.29%	2 2.6%		77 100%
15	21 27.27%	34 44.16%		16 20.78%	5 6.49%	1 1.3%	77 100%
17	34 44.16%	31 40.26%	1 1.3%	8 10.39%	3 3.9%		77 100%

Table 1.

By looking at the preponderance of answers in Table 1 that fall into the "Strongly Agree" and "Slightly Agree" categories, it becomes evident that the evaluators are of one mind relative to the six questions. Therefore, it is safe to make certain assumptions regarding the respondents.

Library evaluators think that they are left to their own devices and techniques when performing evaluations. This viewpoint is based on the facts that SACS does not expect strict adherence to Standard Six and that Standard Six cannot possibly be applied equitably and effectively to all 600 plus libraries of its member institutions. Equipped with such narrow standards and faced with the task of measuring libraries of small junior colleges at one end of the spectrum and large university libraries at the opposite end, evaluators are forced to rely on their own training and experience in performing evaluations. Standard Six merely serves as an authority for evaluations and a point of departure for evaluators.

Evaluators think that SACS should revise the standards, taking into account the obvious differences among libraries. Standard Six should contain certain specific data that could be applied flexibly within certain categories or classifications of libraries. One limited standard cannot, nor should it be expected to, serve adequately as a measuring device to such a myriad of libraries. In effect, library evaluators are requesting that they be released from the subjectivism inherent in such a program. Such an important segment of an academic organization as the library should not be subjected unduly to human capriciousness. The more explicit the standard can be, the better the chances of any one library in receiving a fair and impartial evaluation. Of course, the ramifications to the parent institution are obvious.

The library evaluators agree, with some reservations, that it is possible to evaluate a library's staff and collection within a three day visit. Several respondents believe, however, that the size of the institution's library and the reliability of the library's self-study contribute greatly to the achievement of such a task.

Even though eight respondents commented that educational effectiveness could not be separated from operational efficiency, the majority agreed that as library evaluators, they are more concerned with determining the educational effectiveness of a library than the operational efficiency. The SACS Library Committee on Revision of Standards, which formulated the current library standards, thought that the most important evidence of a library's effectiveness is the nature and extent of use of the library by students and faculty.

The present standard includes such requirements as maintaining a certain number of open library hours, a library committee, seating capacity for one-fourth of the largest number of students on campus at any one time, etc. Such requirements may or may not contribute to library effectiveness; they certainly do not measure effectiveness. In view of the fact that the evaluators are concerned with library effectiveness, perhaps SACS could cause to be constructed an instrument that would permit a measurement of a library's educational effectiveness. Admittedly, it would be extremely difficult to devise an instrument capable of measuring library effectiveness.

It is evident from the responses that almost every evaluator is convinced that the self-study is of vital importance to the library. Since the self-study is usually a labor of twelve months or more involving individuals from several strata of the academic community, it is not likely that a two to three day evaluation can exceed the importance of the former. Evaluators agree that a most important facet of the self-study is that the library is compelled to examine its *raison d'etre*. This introspection allows the library to make a validity check on the compatibility of its goals and purposes with those of the parent institution.

Most evaluators think they were ill or moderately prepared for their initial evaluation visit. This was established in the Background section of the study (see Table 2).

6.* Do you know of any criteria that must be met in order to become an evaluator? Yes 15 , No 62 .

7.* How would you describe your thoughts on preparation for your very first evaluation visit? I was ill prepared 13 , I was moderately prepared 37 , I was well prepared 23 , I had excellent preparation 2 .

10.** It would help an inexperienced evaluator to observe at least one evaluation before being assigned to a visiting evaluation committee. Strongly Agree 40 , Slightly Agree 21 , No Opinion 4 , Slightly Disagree 7 , Strongly Disagree 5 .

* Background
** General Information

Table 2.

In the same section it was revealed that evaluators do not know of any criteria that must be fulfilled in order to become an evaluator. Pursuing this further, it was found that the respondents felt that it would be helpful if a newly-selected evaluator could observe an evaluation visit before conducting one by himself. The probability of an evaluator's being the sole member assigned to Standard Six is very good since 84 per cent of the responding evaluators indicated that they had worked alone. Also, the respondents think that there is a need for better guidance from SACS in the form of quantitative guidelines, check list and/or questionnaires. This conclusion regarding better guidance from SACS coincides with a previous conclusion that evaluators wish to be released from the subjectivism of the evaluations.

However, the evaluators do not think that Standard Six is unenforceable because it lacks normative guidelines. On the contrary, the inherent power wielded by an evaluator can cause favorable administrative action to be implemented, even though some recommendations are not based solidly in Standard Six. Unquestionably, SACS does possess the clout to enforce recommendations of an evaluator.

One potential quantitative requirement that drew strong support from the respondents was the desire to include in the standards a statement compelling institutions to grant full faculty status to librarians. The failure to grant faculty status to librarians is a growing problem, and SACS could perhaps enforce such an autocratic requirement. If this were to happen it would place the accrediting agency in the position of acting as a bargaining agent. Such a position might not be acceptable to SACS. It would gain the sympathy and loyalty of librarians but might alienate the administrators of the institutions.

Library evaluators are unified in their negative reaction to the possibility of excluding the "Suggestion" category from the reports they file with SACS. Also, they agree that their role as evaluators is to evaluate the library and the library's self-study. They may be incorrect in this assumption, however, since SACS interprets their role as educational consultants who will furnish an objective view of the self-study. The inference here is that SACS has failed to communicate its conception of the evaluator's role to the evaluators in the field.

The respondents slightly agree that their viewpoints are not always understood and accepted by other members of the evaluation team. And, rather surprisingly they do not think that a library evaluator should be a member of each evaluation team.

General Information

Section B

Section B, while still soliciting information of a general nature, has been separated because of the different types of answers necessary to complete the questionnaire. In the first section of the General Information segment, the respondent was restricted solely to checking one of the five answers commonly found in the Likert scale and adding comments if so desired. In Section B of the General Information segment, the respondent has a more varied choice of responses, including the insertion of written answers and comments. The separation of questions requiring similar answers was done for the convenience of the respondent.

Question number one in Section B was, "Would it be advisable for SACS to be more specific about the library committee?" Standard Six now states in regard to the library committee, "There should be a proper academic committee concerned for the library which should include the librarian." Twenty-six (33.77 per cent) recommended more specificity and fifty (64.94 per cent) thought that SACS was specific enough. Only one (1.3 per cent) had no opinion regarding the question. One respondent stated that "There is too much diversity among institutions to be more specific." Another said, "In fact all library committees should be either abolished or made solely advisory." The final comment was, "Advisory should be written in."

Since the majority of library committees throughout the country are advisory, question number one was devised to determine if evaluators thought that any changes should be made in the standard, especially in regard to an advisory committee versus a policy making committee. Obviously a more specific statement concerning the library committee is not a great concern to evaluators.

Question number two asked, "Have you ever served on a visiting committee that failed to accredit/re-accredit an institution because of deficiencies in the library?" Fourteen (18.18 per cent) said they had; fifty-nine (76.62 per cent) said they had not and four (5.19 per cent) failed to respond.

Actually the question should have read, "failed to recommend accreditation/re-accreditation," as one respondent pointed out:

> The Visiting Committee, as you are doubtless aware, does not accredit or deny accreditation. It only recommends either action to SACS, the appropriate

> committee within which considers both the Committee's review of the self-study and of its on-campus findings, and the original self-study only if necessary. The Visiting Committee is not as powerful as your questions would indicate--I am sure this is a matter of wording by you, however.

Of the fourteen responses, one added that accreditation was only delayed until the library deficiencies were corrected. Thus, the institution was never without accreditation.

A similar question was posed in number three concerning accreditation and re-accreditation. It asked, "Have you ever served on a visiting committee that failed to accredit/re-accredit an institution for any reason?" Twenty-one (27.27 per cent) answered in the affirmative; thirty-nine (50.65 per cent) said they had not, while fifteen (19.48 per cent) said they did not know. Two (2.6 per cent) did not respond.

In retrospect, the above questions concerning accreditation were not sufficiently detailed to allow any significant conclusions to be drawn from the responses. However, in view of the fact that Standard Six is only one of nine commonly applied standards and, in some instances, one of eleven applied standards, it would appear that perhaps more institutions have their accreditation denied or withheld for library deficiencies than for any other reason.

In answering question number four regarding the honorarium ($50.00) paid to library evaluators, the majority, forty-one (53.35 per cent) stated that the fee was unimportant; ten (12.99 per cent) stated that the present fee should not be changed. There were twenty-six (33.77 per cent) evaluators who thought that the fee should be increased. The suggested increases ranged from $75.00 to $450.00; three respondents suggested $75.00; sixteen thought $100.00 would be appropriate; five indicated the fee should be $150.00; one evaluator suggested $250.00 and one hoped for $450.00.

One of the respondents who stated that the fee is unimportant said, "Evaluation is a professional responsibility." Another added that he normally received $100.00 to $150.00 per day for his services as a consultant to libraries, but he was happy with the present fee paid by SACS since it represented at least a token acknowledgement. There were not any respondents who thought that the fee should be decreased or eliminated. The conclusion is that most evaluators do not expect any significant remuneration for their services.

In addition to the honorarium, evaluators receive reimbursement for travel, lodging and meals. SACS allows evaluators to utilize whatever mode of transportation desirable and will pay up to the limits of first class air travel. There is no limit, within reason, for meals.

Question number five--"Do you think that any new library standards would be more helpful if they were to be written more from the viewpoint of the user?"--received the following replies. Thirty (38.96 per cent) evaluators said yes; thirty-one (40.26 per cent) said no, while fourteen (18.18 per cent) stated they had no opinion. There were two (2.6 per cent) who failed to respond to this question.

Two succinct comments to question five were: "Ambiguous question" and "But not eliminate others." Another more expansive respondent commented, "This would be most interesting to pursue. I am afraid that the user does not know what he wants until it is pointed out by the librarian."

The final comment stated that "All library evaluations are in terms of clientele." Ideally this is true, for the ideal evaluation of an institution and therefore any of its components, including the library, would be the valid measurement of the product of that institution, the student. The data derived from such a measurement, however, would be meaningless until they were juxtaposed with data from similar institutions.

If it were possible to devise a measuring device that would serve as a valid, reliable evaluative tool in discerning the quality of the graduate, then evaluations would pose less of a problem than they do. If library evaluators were able to determine the extent and nature of library use by the students, it would not be unwarranted to assume that the result would be a measurement of educational effectiveness. At this time, however, it appears that the academic library profession has only the crudest ideas concerning the quantity and quality of reading accomplished by its clientele. If the profession had more precise measures of the reading habits of college students it would enable accrediting agencies such as SACS not only to measure the effectiveness of the library but the vitality of the entire instructional program as well.

Therefore, if standards were to be written from a viewpoint compatible to and in sympathy with the users, they just might provide a base for a whole new concept of standards. Since libraries are service oriented organizations, it would behoove them to become more knowledgeable of their patrons. However, the respondents were about equally divided in their decisions as to whether user-oriented standards would be helpful.

In answering question number six, the responding evaluators were about equally divided. Question six asked, "Should SACS introduce some quantitative standards into Standard Six?" Thirty-five (45.45 per cent) said yes; thirty-two (41.56 per cent) said no; eight (10.39 per cent) had no opinion, and two (2.6 per cent) did not respond.

One respondent commented:

> Evaluators may use quantitative standards now as comparative tools for making judgements. Example: the library collection is below the minimum number of volumes as recommended by the ALA standards for colleges of comparable size.

Others commented that quantitative standards "would be good for some institutions, bad for others" and that implementation could only be done "with extreme caution." Another said that quantitative standards should not be included because "standards are not quantitatively perfected."

The final comment warned about not learning from past mistakes when he said, "We ought to avoid rigidity, we have been through that. Quantitative standards could be helpful only if they were flexible." Obviously this comment was referring to the fact that SACS, like other accrediting agencies, once had a rigid set of criteria to apply to institutions seeking accreditation. In the case of the library, inflexible quantitative standards caused a crippling conformity for several decades. Standards which unyieldingly demanded that a library possess a finite number of books and even supplied a bibliography of such books deteriorated to a required buying list. Libraries would buy the books needed to meet the standards regardless of their educational needs. Later it was decided that perhaps the quality of the library's holding was more important than merely possessing a finite number of titles.

Of those who oppose re-introduction of quantitative standards, the most widely-heard arguments are that it has been tried in the past and it does not take into account the institution's individuality. Evidently the evaluators responding to the question are not convinced one way or the other.

Question number seven asked, "Do you find the information supplied by SACS helpful in library evaluations?" A majority of sixty-four (83.12 per cent) answered yes; eight (10.39 per cent) said no, and five (6.49 per cent) had no opinion.

Apparently most evaluators are satisfied with very little information because as one respondent commented, "All the evaluator gets from SACS is a copy of the standards." Actually SACS sends each evaluator a copy of the standards, a copy of the self-study manual, a travel voucher for claiming expenses, the names and schools of other visiting evaluators, and a mimeographed sheet explaining what is expected of an evaluator. While such information may be helpful to a first-time evaluator, it is of dubious assistance to experienced evaluators since the same information is supplied for each visit. Perhaps, as a way of explanation, the respondents were confusing the material received from SACS and the material received from the host institution. The latter usually consists of a copy of the self-study, a copy of the faculty handbook, a college or university catalog and other material directly relevant to the host institution. This material undoubtedly is of immense benefit to the evaluators, while the material received from SACS pales in comparison.

Forty-three (55.84 per cent) answered in the affirmative to question eight, which asked, "Have you ever been requested to evaluate any other aspect of an institution while serving as the library evaluator?" Thirty-three (42.86 per cent) said no and one (1.3 per cent) did not respond.

A sub-section of the above question requested the respondents to identify the area in which they performed the additional evaluation. The following is a list of such areas. If more than one evaluator had performed evaluations in similar areas, the total number appears in parentheses. An "illustration" is a segment of a "standard."

Alumni, Illustration Eight of STANDARD TWO, Organization and Administration

Audio-Visual Department (2)

Bookstore

Commerce Department

Computer Usage

Curriculum, Illustration Two of STANDARD THREE, Educational Program

Educational Program, STANDARD THREE

English Department

Extra-class Activities, Illustration Three of STANDARD SEVEN, Student Development Services (2)

Faculty, STANDARD TWO (6)

Faculty Organization, Illustration Two of STANDARD FIVE, Faculty

Graduate Program, STANDARD TEN

Instruction, Illustration Three of STANDARD THREE, Educational Program

Library Science Department (2)

Organization and Administration, STANDARD TWO (2)

Physical Education Department

Physical Plant, STANDARD EIGHT (5)

Plant Facilities, Existing, and Expansion of, Illustrations One and Two of STANDARD EIGHT, Physical Plant (2)

Purpose, STANDARD ONE (3)

Special Activities, STANDARD NINE (3)

Student Development Services, STANDARD SEVEN (5)

There is a total of eleven standards each of which covers a distinct and separate aspect of an institution of higher education. These eleven standards are:[1]

STANDARD ONE, Purpose (of the institution)

STANDARD TWO, Organization and Administration

STANDARD THREE, Educational Program

STANDARD FOUR, Financial Resources

STANDARD FIVE, Faculty

STANDARD SIX, Library

STANDARD SEVEN, Student Development Services

---

[1] The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Standards of the College Delegate Assembly. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972.

STANDARD EIGHT, Physical Plant

STANDARD NINE, Special Activities

STANDARD TEN, Graduate Program

STANDARD ELEVEN, Research

The first nine standards are usually applied to junior and senior colleges, and, of course, Standards Ten and Eleven are applied only to universities and/or institutions engaged in research. Of the eleven standards, respondents have performed evaluations within nine of them. Standard Four, Financial Resources, is traditionally assigned to Business Managers, Auditors, Vice Presidents in Charge of Finance, etc., and no evaluator responding has served in this area.

Standard Eleven, Research, is customarily limited to large institutions and SACS normally sends the largest groups of evaluators to such institutions. Therefore, there are in all probability, more experienced members of those teams who could perform more effective evaluations of Research Programs than librarians. In addition, the complexity and size of libraries of large institutions probably preclude the library evaluator from performing in two areas.

Consequently, library evaluators have performed evaluations in nine of the areas covered by the standards, the exceptions being Standard Four, Financial Resources, and Standard Eleven, Research. The respondents have served either as the sole committee member or as a committee member assigned to one specific aspect or illustration. In addition, they have been requested to evaluate specific entities such as individual instructional departments, bookstores, and computer usage.

Section B of question eight asked the forty-three respondents, "Do you think your qualifications enabled you to make an efficient and effective evaluation of this additional assignment?" Of the total of forty-three, twenty-nine (67.44 per cent) said they were qualified and fourteen (32.56 per cent) said they were not.

The only comment was, "I have always felt free to express my opinion about any aspect of the college and am personally interested in the degree to which the faculty participates in faculty governance." The comment was not directly connected since the question asked if SACS had ever assigned the respondent to another standard, and whether the respondent was qualified to make an efficient and effective evaluation.

The most significant finding as revealed by question number eight is that approximately a third (32.56 per cent) of the evaluators who perform other evaluations do not believe that they are qualified to do so. Surely, the institutions undergoing evaluations would not appreciate having any facets of their organizations evaluated by one who does not think he possesses adequate evaluative qualifications. Certainly SACS should implement more rigorous screening of its evaluators in order to prevent the dilution of the accrediting process which is so vitally important to colleges and universities.

The ninth question was a five part question that asked: "Do you visit the library at night: (1) To observe library use, (2) To interview library users, (3) To determine if the lighting is adequate, (4) To observe availability of personnel and (5) Never visit the library at night.

Sixty-one visit the library at night to observe the extent of use by the academic community. Thirty-seven interview the patrons; thirty-eight use this opportunity to determine if the lighting is adequate and forty observe the availability of library personnel. Ten never visit the library at night.

In addition to reasons mentioned above, one respondent said that he would "Check noise levels, observe area around the library and check safety features." Two of the ten who said that they never visit the library at night gave the following reasons: "No time to do so," and "Lack of time due to committee meetings."

Question number ten asked, "Do you have your own check list of items to observe during an evaluation?" Sixty-one (79.22 per cent) of the evaluators said they did have; fourteen (18.18 per cent) said they did not, and two (2.6 per cent) did not respond.

In a similar vein question number eleven queried the evaluators with, "Do you have your own list of questions to ask interviewees?" Sixty-three (81.82 per cent) did have their own list of questions and thirteen (16.88 per cent) did not rely upon a list of questions. One (1.3 per cent) failed to respond to the question.

Evidently, library evaluators have acted in a rather resourceful manner in the majority of cases and devised a check list and a questionnaire. The fact that so many respondents have deemed it necessary to fashion their own check lists and questionnaires can only lead one to conclude that this was done specifically to fulfill a definite need. It would be interesting to pool these self-made check lists and questionnaires with a view toward consolidating the most popular and useful items into a "universal" list. Perhaps it would be appropriate for SACS to obtain input from library evaluators relative to check lists and questionnaires. This information could serve a useful purpose when SACS begins the revision of the library standards.

Concerning the revision of the library standards, question twelve asked the respondents, "Are you aware that SACS has now initiated a long-term study to revise its library standard?" Thirty-two (41.56 per cent) said they were aware of this; forty-four (57.14 per cent) said they were not, and there was one (1.3 per cent) who made no response.

Returning to check lists and questionnaires, question number thirteen stated, "A check list or questionnaire prepared by SACS would be helpful as an evaluative tool." Again, as in questions ten and eleven, a clear majority, fifty-seven (74.03 per cent) answered yes; nine (11.69 per cent) said no; ten (12.99 per cent) voiced no opinion and one (1.3 per cent) did not respond.

In analyzing the responses to questions ten, eleven and thirteen (see Table 3), it is obvious that (1) check lists and questionnaires are used extensively by the library evaluators, (2) these documents are produced individually to satisfy an unfulfilled need, and (3) the respondents think that similar documents prepared by SACS would be helpful as evaluative tools.

10. Do you have your own check list of items to observe during an evaluation? Yes 61 , No 14 , No response 2 .

11. Do you have your own list of questions to ask interviewees? Yes 63 , No 13 , No response 1 .

13. A check list or questionnaire prepared by SACS would be helpful as an evaluative tool. Yes 57 , No 9 , No opinion 10 , No response 1 .

Table 3.

Question number fourteen asked, "How do you determine the adequacy of the library collection?" Standard Six states, "The book and periodical collection should, by quality, size and nature, support and stimulate the entire educational program." The evaluators were given five statements that could be checked which would indicate the frequency of the techniques utilized to determine collection adequacy. These statements were:

> (1) Make extensive checks of the collection against standard bibliographies, (2) Interview library staff, faculty and students to ascertain their success or

> failure in finding the materials needed by them, (3) Spot check titles against bibliographies, (4) Compare the numerical total of the collection with some quantitative standard such as given by H. E. W., A. L. A., or the Clapp/Jordan formula, and (5) Assume that if the collection were inadequate and unable to "support and stimulate the entire educational program" it would so state in the library self-study.

Thirteen of the respondents make extensive checks of the collection against standard bibliographies. Seventy-one interview library staff, faculty and students to ascertain their success or failure in finding the materials needed by them. Forty-seven spot check titles against bibliographies. Fifty-three evaluators compare the numerical total of the collection with some quantitative standard such as given by H. E. W., A. L. A., or the Clapp/Jordan formula. Finally, twelve assume that if the collection were inadequate and unable to "support and stimulate the entire educational program," it would so state in the library self-study.

One of the comments was, "I do not assume . . . , not in a naive sense. I request the faculty members on the committee to review collections." Another comment was, "Hopefully the self-study would reflect this information." The final comment stated, "I check the shelf list in some areas in which I have some expertise."

In summary, the evaluator determines the adequacy of the collection by interviewing library staff, faculty and students primarily. The second most frequently utilized determining factor is the comparison of the numerical total of the collection against some published quantitative standard. The third determinant is to compare a sampling of titles against bibliographies.

"Has SACS ever requested you to generate feedback for the purpose of improving evaluative techniques?" was question number fifteen. Of the seventy-seven respondents, fifteen (19.48 per cent) answered that they had been requested to generate feedback while sixty-one (79.22 per cent) said they had not. One (1.3 per cent) failed to respond.

A sub-question to question fifteen asked, "If answer to above was yes, did you cooperate and submit any input?" No one answered this question.

Queried about whether they apprise the host library director of their findings before leaving, the evaluators responded to question number sixteen with fifty-three (68.83 per cent) replying in the affirmative. Twenty-three (29.87 per cent) said they did not and one (1.3 per cent) did not respond to the question.

One evaluator stated that he apprised the library director of any findings only "As directed by the committee chairman." Another said he apprised the director "In general terms only and do not indicate suggestions or recommendations." Another comment was:

> If specific areas of concern to the librarian have been identified and answers to these problems have been elicited from appropriate administrative staff members, this information is passed on to the librarian. The librarian is also generally included in the group invited to participate in the final reporting conference with the Visitation Committee. However, the librarian is not apprised of the Committee's findings which are recommendations for SACS only, and are confidential.

A respondent warned in his comment that this is "Not the job of the evaluator." A similar comment was, "Only in a general way, only the team chairman can speak for the evaluators." However, these two particular commentators may be a little confused. SACS does require official comments given to the press to be made by the committee chairman with members of the institution's administration present. At no time are the chairman and the committee members free to speak to the question of the institution's accreditation status. At any rate, with fifty-three of the seventy-seven respondents informing the directors of their findings, it is safe to assume that

SACS has not directed the evaluators to do otherwise.

Question seventeen stated, "Feedback from SACS would help you to perform evaluations more effectively and efficiently." Fifty-seven (74.03 per cent) answered yes; five (6.49 per cent) said no, and fourteen (18.18 per cent) voiced no opinion. One (1.3 per cent) failed to respond.

When asked, "Have you ever received any feedback from SACS relative to your reports?" five (6.49 per cent) said that they had, but sixty-nine (89.61 per cent) replied that they had not. Three (3.9 per cent) made no response to the question. The respondents who answered in the affirmative were asked to indicate if the feedback from SACS had been helpful, non-helpful, positive, negative, constructive, official and/or informal. Only one of the five replied to this question and his answer was that the feedback had been in an informal conversation with a SACS's officer.

In responding to question number nineteen--"Have you ever attempted to aid a library to gain favorable administrative consideration for a long-neglected item through your influence as a library evaluator?"--sixty-two (80.52 per cent) of the respondents stated they had done this. Five (6.49 per cent) said they had not;

seven (9.09 per cent) did not know whether they had or not and three (3.9 per cent) did not respond.

Two brief comments were: "Ambiguous question," and "This constitutes a recommendation generally." The third person to comment was suspicious of the meaning of the question. He said:

> The tone of the question implies improper use of influence or unethical conduct. This, of course, an evaluator should avoid. However, where a library is understaffed, or under budgeted, it is the responsibility of the evaluator to state the situation honestly and tactfully, and recommend changes and improvements.

Of course, the researcher did not intend to imply that by aiding a library the evaluator would be guilty of improper use of influence or unethical conduct. Rather, the implied meaning of question nineteen was to discern if evaluators were kindly disposed toward the host library or unfriendly and aggressive. The sixty-two affirmative answers confirm that evaluators are, for the most part, sympathetic to the plights of the libraries undergoing the visitation.

Question number twenty asked, "Have you ever received any training from SACS on proper evaluative techniques and/or report writing?" Only thirteen evaluators replied to this question. Ten respondents had had SACS-sponsored training in both evaluative techniques and report writing, and three had had training only in evaluative techniques. One respondent commented that he had "Assisted with both in Atlanta several years ago."

When asked, "Have you been invited to supply any input into SACS's revision of the library standards?" only eight replied in the affirmative. Significantly, sixty-eight (88.31 per cent) said they had not been asked to participate. One evaluator (1.3 per cent) failed to make a response. When asked, "Would you participate if asked?" seventy (90.91 per cent) answered yes; three (3.9 per cent) said no; one (1.3 per cent) said he did not know if he would participate or not, and there were three (3.9 per cent) who did not respond.

As an aid to focusing upon the questions and their responses relative to communications between SACS and its evaluators, the questions and answers are grouped in Table 4.

It is clearly indicated in Table 4 that the library evaluators and SACS are not communicating with each other. The communication link between the evaluators and SACS is, at best, tenuous. With such a vast amount of knowledge about evaluations residing in one group of people, it is puzzling why SACS has never availed itself of such, especially since the evaluators are perfectly willing to share their experiences and opinions.

15. Has SACS ever requested you to generate feedback for the purpose of improving evaluative techniques? Yes 15, No 61, No response 1.

17. Feedback from SACS would help you to perform evaluations more effectively and efficiently. Yes 57, No 5, No opinion 14, No response 1.

18. Have you ever received any feedback from SACS relative to your reports? Yes 5, No 69, No response 3.

21. Have you ever been invited to supply any input into SACS's revision of the library standards? Yes 8, No 68, No response 1.

Would you participate if asked? Yes 70, No 3, Do not know 1, No response 3.

Table 4.

Evidently SACS is under the impression that it does not need any input from the people who are actually executing the evaluations. On the other hand, the evaluators feel that SACS could help them and the member institutions if it would only generate some sort of feedback.

Significantly, question twenty-one received more comments than any other single question in the entire questionnaire when it asked, "What recommendations would you suggest, that in your opinion, would help improve library evaluations?" Obviously the library evaluators are concerned about the standards which they apply and have given the matter much thought as is reflected in their comments.

The comments offered are:

> Revise the questionnaire form now being used for candidacy and initial accreditation.
>
> Revise the standard so that it will be applicable to a Learning Resource Center concept of mixed media as well as the traditional library.
>
> Since an evaluator generally follows the illustrations as listed in Standard Six, the "Manual for the Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study" should provide guidelines for these same nine illustrations, in the same order.
>
> I would stress allowance for individual differences and also the place of other nearby collections in the evaluation.
>
> One generalized standard cannot be equally applicable to all types of post-high school institutions.

In addition to the college catalog and status report, provide the evaluator with current annual reports, or statistical reports (Federal, State or local) compiled by the librarian prior to the accreditation visitation.

We need a statement about professional growth of librarians, i.e., attendance at workshops, institutes, in-service training and further study for advanced degrees.

We need standard questionnaires that can be used for faculty and student evaluations of library services. These instruments could be designed so that flexibility can be incorporated.

We need to obtain feedback from the librarians to ascertain if quantitative guidelines are needed and if qualitative check lists, e.g., suggested bibliographies are necessary. As it stands now, the standards are flexible so that the library can meet its needs according to the purposes of its institution.

Begin with what we have. They are not too bad. Work from there in areas that need revision.

I am not particularly proud of my first efforts with no experience or training. Fortunately, it was a good institution and I feel I did no harm. After the Atlanta training session in which I participated later, and my own institution's self-study, I feel much more certain of my evaluative abilities.

> Develop different sets of standards for different types (or sizes) of libraries; up-date the illustrative areas to take care of newer library concerns--management, automated activities, audio-visual materials and services, etc. Eliminate illustration one; the volume in question is no longer being published, and using it is virtually impossible anyway, or was, unless one had loads of time in which to do the calculations. More emphasis should be put, too, on goals and objectives, and on services per se.
>
> I think the main weakness in the SACS's evaluation procedure is lack of training for the team members. The result of using both experienced and inexperienced people, and ones who never get feedback except by being invited to serve again, is a wild variation of reports. A "hard" team, or one with a "hard" chairman, will make an institution look pretty bad, while the same institution could have shown up very well with "easy" team. I've been on both kinds.
>
> At least one visit as an apprentice member of the team would help. Guidelines, or check lists, could be an aid. The Manual for the Self-Study, could serve this purpose if it were written to coincide with the illustrations instead of being organized quite differently. I suggest, too, that only team members should be selected who have had experience in their own institution's self-study.
>
> I recommend that the self-study compile standardized statistics that could be used not for comparison to other libraries, but in estimating the library's own effectiveness, user satisfaction, and success rate.

In the upcoming revision of the library standards, instead of allowing a few librarians to enter the decision making process concerning standards it seems entirely appropriate to gather the maximum input possible from the maximum amount of evaluators as possible. If SACS is willing to listen, the librarians are eager to speak.

Summary

The data produced by this study, though not exhaustive, suggests that more institutions have their accreditation denied or withheld because of library deficiencies than for any other reason.

The respondents are satisfied with the current honorarium ($50.00) that is now being paid for their services. A few would like to see it increased in varying amounts, but no one thought that it should be decreased or eliminated.

A slight majority of the respondents thought that the standards should not be written from the viewpoint of the user. If library standards were to be written from a viewpoint compatible to and in sympathy with the users, they just might be able to provide a base for a totally new concept of standards. Since libraries are service-oriented organizations, it would behoove them to become more knowledgeable about their patrons.

Library evaluators are divided as to whether SACS should introduce quantitative standards into Standard Six. A slight majority is in favor of the addition of quantitative standards. Of those who oppose re-introduction of quantitative standards, the most widely-heard arguments are that it has been tried in the past and they do not take into account the institution's individuality. However, it is doubtful if the same mistakes would be repeated. New quantitative standards would probably be written in ranges of percentages by classes of libraries or parent institutions rather than one standard being inflexibly applied to all libraries.

A large majority of the respondents believes that the material supplied by SACS is helpful in their library evaluations. However, the material received from SACS consists of a copy of the standards, a copy of the self-study manual, a travel voucher for claiming expenses, the names and the schools represented by other members of the evaluating team, and a mimeographed sheet explaining what is expected of an evaluator. While such information may be helpful to a first-time evaluator, it is of dubious assistance to experienced evaluators since the same material is supplied for each succeeding visit. Perhaps, by way of explanation, the respondents were confusing the material received from the host institution. This material, undoubtedly, is of immense benefit to the evaluators, while the material received from SACS pales in comparison.

Forty-three of the seventy-six evaluators responding stated that they had been called upon to evaluate segments of an institution other than the library. They had evaluated programs, or parts of programs, in all standards except Standard Four, Financial Resources and Standard Eleven, Research. In addition they were called upon to evaluate individual department's of instruction and in one case, the bookstore. The evaluators have served as the sole committee member; hence they automatically become the chairman of that committee, or as a committee member assigned to one specific aspect or illustration.

Of the forty-three evaluators who served on other standards, fourteen said that they were not qualified to evaluate these additional assignments effectively. With approximately a third (32.56 per cent) of the evaluators performing evaluations in fields in which they feel no competence, SACS should not assign librarians to additional standards. Surely, the institution undergoing evaluation would feel some apprehensiveness about having an evaluator assigned a segment of its program who by his own admission, feels unqualified to evaluate it. If SACS insists upon librarians being assigned other tasks, it should implement a rigorous screening of its library evaluators to prevent a member institution from being evaluated in part by an ineffective evaluator.

Library evaluators visit the library at night primarily to observe the extent of use by the academic community. In order of decreasing frequency the visits are made to determine the availability of library personnel, to determine if the lighting is adequate and to interview the patrons.

Evidently, library evaluators have acted in a rather resourceful manner in the majority of cases and have devised individual check lists and questionnaires. The fact that so many respondents have deemed it necessary to fashion their own check lists and questionnaires can only lead one to conclude that this was done specifically to fulfill a definite need. It would be interesting to pool these self-made check lists and questionnaires with a view toward consolidating the most popular items into a "universal" list. Perhaps it would behoove SACS to obtain input from library evaluators relative to check lists and questionnaires. This information could serve a useful purpose when SACS revises the library standards.

By grouping and analyzing three key questions (see Table 3). it is obvious that (1) check lists and questionnaires are used extensively by the library evaluators; (2) these documents are produced individually to satisfy an unfulfilled need, and (3) the respondents think that if SACS would produce similar documents, they would be helpful as an evaluative tool.

In order to determine the adequacy of collections, library evaluators employ three techniques more frequently than others. In order of decreasing frequency they are: (1) interviewing library staff, faculty and students to ascertain their success or failure in finding the materials needed by them, (2) comparing the numerical total of the collection with some quantitative standard such as H. E. W., A. L. A. or the Clapp/Jordan formula, and (3) spot checking titles in the card catalog against bibliographies. A distinct minority assumes that the collection is adequate if no mention is made of its inadequacy in the self-study.

A comparison of the responses elicited by question four in the General Information section and the responses garnered by question nineteen in the General Information, Section B portion, is made in Table 5.

The conclusion based upon Table 5 is that libraries benefit from undergoing evaluations by members of the library profession. Obviously the library evaluators are sympathetic with the plights and frustrations of the host library staff and often take steps to remedy certain situations through their authority as SACS representatives. This perhaps subverts the purposes of SACS but within the wide latitude that evaluators range, it is permissible.

4.* A library evaluator often acts as a catalyst to speed up a segment of the host library's program by using the leverage inherent in the authority of the accrediting agency. Strongly agree 42 , Slightly agree 27 , No opinion 2 , Slightly disagree 3 , Strongly disagree 0 , No response 3 .

19. Have you ever attempted to aid a library to gain favorable administrative consideration for a long-neglected item through your influence as a library evaluator? Yes 62 , No 5 , Do not know 7 , No response 3 .

*General Information Section

Table 5.

Reports

In the Reports section, library evaluators were asked to make a choice as to how they would report a situation encountered on an evaluation visit. The specific request was: "Assuming that you would encounter the conditions listed below, would you as a library evaluator: (1) include a statement describing the condition in the text of your report but with no specific suggestion or recommendation, (2) include the condition in the category of Suggestions, (3) include the condition in the category of Recommendations, or (4) not report it at all?

It should be noted that a recommendation compels the institution to implement the recommendation or explain satisfactorily the reasons why it cannot be implemented. A suggestion is merely intended to be helpful advice; it requires no action from the institution. The inclusion of a specific situation in the text of the report is tantamount to merely describing the condition. Naturally, if a condition is not reported at all, it has been ignored.

While the Reports section does not reflect an actual evaluation environment, the conditions contained therein are actual segments of reports submitted to SACS by its evaluators. Since these conditions are actual cases, and have been included in reports, there are, of course, no instances when a correct answer would have been "(4) not report it at all." Naturally this could not have been revealed to the respondents since it would have narrowed the choice of options that are normally available to them in actual evaluations.

The analysis will be accomplished in the following manner. The responses will be analyzed and displayed in the order they appeared in the questionnaire. The numerical total and the percentage total will be given; these totals represent the answers received from the total population responding. Then, in order to determine if any differences exist among the different evaluators, the evaluators will be separated and grouped by types of libraries evaluated. There will be four groups and they will be designated as follows:

(1) LU will represent those evaluators who have primarily evaluated libraries of large universities;

(2) SU will represent those evaluators who have primarily evaluated libraries of small universities;

(3) FY will represent those evaluators who have primarily evaluated libraries of four year colleges;

(4) JC will represent those evaluators who have primarily evaluated libraries of junior colleges.

Because of the wide disparity in the total numbers of evaluators within each group, the comparisons of responses will be displayed in percentages only.

At the end of the Reports section there will be a summary of tabulations displayed in tables along with cross-comparisons of responses by groups.

Table 6

Summary of Responses to Question 1

(1) The library collection, in your opinion, is not sufficient to support the informational needs of the institution.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
5	3	69			77
6.49%	3.9%	89.61%			100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU			100%			100%
SU	7.2%	7.2%	85.7%			100%
FY	6.8%	4.5%	88.6%			100%
JC	10%		90%			100%

Table 7

Summary of Responses to Question 2

(2) Librarians are paid significantly lower than teaching faculty with the same rank.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
3	26	45	3		77
3.90%	33.77%	58.44%	3.90%		100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	11.1%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%		100%
SU		50%	42.3%	7.2%		100%
FY	4.5%	31.8%	63.6%			100%
JC		10%	80%	10%		100%

Table 8

Summary of Responses to Question 3

(3) The collection is not tested by checking it against bibliographies.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
5	35	27	10		77
4.49%	45.45%	35.06%	12.99%		100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	11.1%	11.1%	77.8%			100%
SU		50%	28.6%	21.4%		100%
FY	6.8%	54.5%	29.6%	9.1%		100%
JC	10%	30%	30%	30%		100%

Table 9

Summary of Responses to Question 4

(4) The library administration continues to hire professional librarians without regard to whether they graduated from an A. L. A. accredited library school or not.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
13 16.88%	30 38.96%	21 27.27%	13 16.88%		77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	11.1%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%		100%
SU	14.3%	35.7%	28.6%	21.4%		100%
FY	18.2%	45.5%	25%	11.4%		100%
JC	20%	10%	30%	40%		100%

Table 10

Summary of Responses to Question 5

(5) The library director is not a member of the Graduate Council. *NA

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
12 15.58%	29 37.66%	23 29.87%	4 5.19%	9* 11.69%	77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	22.2%	33.3%	44.4%			100%
SU	21.4%	57.1%	21.4%			100%
FY	11.4%	36.4%	34.1%	4.5%	13.6%*	100%
JC	20%	20%	10%	10%	30%	100%

Table 11

Summary of Responses to Question 6

(6) Communications among the librarians are not sufficient due to irregular and widely spaced staff meetings.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
16 20.78%	43 55.84%	14 18.18%	4 5.19%		77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%			100%
SU	21.4%	57.1%	21.4%			100%
FY	18.2%	59.1%	18.2%	4.5%		100%
JC	40%	20%	20%	20%		100%

Table 12

Summary of Responses to Question 7

(7) The library only has stairs connecting the other floors, no elevators or book lifts.

**NR

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
18 23.38%	19 24.68%	29 37.66%	8 10.39%	3** 3.90%	77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	22.2%	33.3%	22.2%	11.1%	11.1%**	100%
SU	21.4%	28.6%	21.4%	28.6%		100%
FY	22.7%	20.5%	45.4%	6.8%	4.5%	100%
JC	30%	30%	40%			100%

Table 13

Summary of Responses to Question 8

---

(8) The library closes from 5 P. M. to 7 P. M. each day because experience has indicated this to be the time of lowest usage. The staff thinks that it is best to close and conserve staff time for periods of heavier use. **NR

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
12 15.88%	21 27.27%	4 5.19%	37 48.05%	3** 3.90%	77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	22.2%	44.4%	11.1%	22.2%		100%
SU	7.2%		21.4%	71.4%		100%
FY	15.9%	34.1%		43.2%	6.8%**	100%
JC	20%	20%		60%		100%

Table 14

Summary of Responses to Question 9

(9) The library purchases books only and will not provide non-book materials.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
9 11.69%	21 27.27%	41 53.25%	3 3.90%		77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	22.2%	11.1%	66.7%			100%
SU		35.7%	42.9%	21.4%		100%
FY	11.4%	34.1%	47.8%	6.8%		100%
JC	20%		80%			100%

Table 15

Summary of Responses to Question 10

(10) The library of a commuter college is not open 60 hours per week, but, experience has shown that the heaviest use of the library is from 8 A. M. to 5 P. M., Monday - Friday and Saturday from 10 A. M. to 4 P. M. With no students living on campus and with an insignificant number returning at night, the library staff feels that it is giving quality service during hours that it is needed instead of diminishing the quality of service by remaining open during hours of little or no use. **NR

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
24	15	24	13	1**	77
31.17%	19.48%	31.17%	16.88%	1.30%	100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	11.1%	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%		100%
SU	21.4%	21.4%	14.3%	35.7%	7.1%**	100%
FY	40.1%	22.7%	22.7%	13.6%		100%
JC	20%	10%	70%			100%

Table 16

Summary of Responses to Question 11

(11) The library does not have representation on the Curriculum Development Committee that would enable it to anticipate and meet instructional and research needs. **NR

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
6 7.79%	31 40.26%	38 49.35%	1 1.30%	1** 1.30%	77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU		77.8%	11.1%	11.1%		100%
SU	7.2%	57.1%	35.7%			100%
FY	6.8%	29.5%	61.4%		2.3%**	100%
JC	20%	30%	50%			100%

Table 17

Summary of Responses to Question 12

(12) The major portions of the majority of the library departmental budget allocations are consistently returned to the library's General Fund unexpended.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
8 10.39%	29 37.66%	37 48.05%	3 3.90%		77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%			100%
SU		42.9%	57.1%			100%
FY	11.4%	25%	56.8%	6.8%		100%
JC	20%	70%	10%			100%

Table 18

Summary of Responses to Question 13

(13) The Faculty Library Committee is a policy making body which utilizes the library director to implement its decisions. **NR

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
5	14	51	5	2**	77
6.49%	18.18%	66.23%	6.49%	2.60%	100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	11.1%	33.3%	55.6%			100%
SU		21.4%	71.4%	7.2%		100%
FY	9.1%	6.8%	72.7%	9.1%	2.3% **	100%
JC		50%	40%		10%	100%

Table 19

Summary of Responses to Question 14

(14) Instructional departments, for the most part, are inactive in recommending library materials for purchase.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
9	35	29	4		77
11.69%	45.45%	37.66%	5.19%		100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	22.2%	22.2%	55.6%			100%
SU		64.3%	14.3%	21.4%		100%
FY	11.4%	40.9%	45.5%	2.7%		100%
JC	20%	60%	20%			100%

Table 20

Summary of Responses to Question 15

---

(15) The library falls below the A. L. A. standard of receiving a minimum of 5% of the total Educational and General budget.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
9	20	45	3		77
11.69%	25.97%	58.44%	3.90%		100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%			100%
SU	21.4%	28.6%	42.9%	7.2%		100%
FY	6.8%	22.7%	68.1%	2.3%		100%
JC	20%	10%	60%	10%		100%

15

15

Table 21

Summary of Responses to Question 16

(16) No systematic weeding has taken place within the past ten years.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
9 11.69%	29 37.66%	33 42.86%	6 7.79%		77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	33.3%		55.6%	11.1%		100%
SU	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%		100%
FY	9.1%	38.6%	45.4%	6.8%		100%
JC		60%	40%			100%

Table 22

Summary of Responses to Question 17

(17) The total number of volumes does not match the number suggested by the Clapp/Jordan formula for an institution of its size and curriculum.

TOTAL RESPONDENTS

TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
15 19.48%	19 24.68%	27 35.06%	16 20.78%		77 100%

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY TYPES OF LIBRARIES EVALUATED

	TEXT	SUGGESTION	RECOMMENDATION	NOT AT ALL	NA/NR	TOTAL
LU	22.2%	22.2%	33.3%	22.2%		100%
SU	21.4%	35.7%	21.4%	21.4%		100%
FY	15.9%	25%	43.2%	15.9%		100%
JC	30%	10%	20%	40%		100%

The Summary of Responses on SACS Reports (see Table 23) is divided into four categories, LU, SU, FY and JC. Within each of these four categories the responses will be divided between those that agreed or disagreed with the original reports submitted to SACS. The totals within each category represent the number of respondents multiplied by the total number of questions minus the "no responses." LU had nine respondents; SU had fourteen respondents; FY had forty-four respondents and JC had ten. Therefore, LU (9) X number of questions (17) is 153 minus one "no response" equals 152.

Summary of Responses on SACS Reports

	LU			FY	
Agree	67	(44.1%)	Agree	298	(40.5%)
Disagree	85	(55.9%)	Disagree	437	(59.5%)
Total	152	(100%)	Total	735	(100%)
	SU			JC	
Agree	81	(34.2%)	Agree	53	(32.1%)
Disagree	156	(65.8%)	Disagree	112	(67.9%)
Total	237	(100%)	Total	165	(100%)

Median Agreement 37.7%

Table 23

It is evident from Table 23 that the responses from the LU group most nearly approximate those of the original reports contained in the questionnaire. However, as a group they failed to agree less than fifty per cent of the time with a total of 44.1 per cent. The FY group agreed with the original reports in 40.5 per cent of the instances; SU agreed 34.2 per cent of the time and the JC group agreed in less than a third of the instances with a total of 32.1 per cent.

It is apparent that the respondents who have primarily evaluated large university libraries tend to have selected more "correct" answers than those of the three other groups. However, there is no "correct" answer in an absolute sense because the conditions that appeared in the questionnaire were reported by the respondents themselves initially. Since there are few quantitative guidelines that will allow a definite reaction to a condition by an evaluator, the correct answers are, in a large number of instances, very subjective in nature.

In an attempt to explore further the degree of uniformity in the reports of evaluators it was decided to compare the responses in the Reports section to those made most frequently by the respondents. In other words, each condition was analyzed not by those who agreed or disagreed with the original reports, but by the reaction of the majority of responses to a condition. For example, maybe only twenty-five respondents agreed with a particular reaction made in the original reports, whereas a majority of perhaps thirty-nine agreed on some other selection. Therefore, the responses were re-tabulated completely. In the cases where the majority of the respondents agreed on a reaction that was contrary to the original reports, the majority opinion was tabulated in lieu of the "correct" answer. These results are shown in Table 24.

Summary of Responses on the Majority Opinion

	LU			FY	
Agree	67	(44.1%)	Agree	394	(53.6%)
Disagree	85	(55.9%)	Disagree	341	(46.4%)
Total	152	(100%)	Total	735	(100%)
	SU			**JC**	
Agree	112	(47.3%)	Agree	78	(47.3%)
Disagree	125	(52.7%)	Disagree	87	(52.7%)
Total	237	(100%)	Total	165	(100%)

Median of Agreement 47.4%

Table 24

On the average the respondent's answers agreed with those of the original reports in only 37.7 per cent (see Table 23) of the instances. On the other hand, there was an average of agreement in 47.4 percent (see Table 24) of the cases when the majority opinion was tabulated. This could indicate that the responses to the SACS's report are not indicative of how the majority of evaluators would respond to a similar situation. As has been stated earlier, there is a large amount of subjectivism inherent in the current accrediting process in regard to libraries. Such subjectivism probably accounts for the fact that in none of the two tabulations did the average response agreement exceed 50 per cent. Within the individual groups, LU remained at exactly the same level in both cases, 44.1 per cent agreement. The other groups, SU, FY, and JC improved their agreement percentage dramatically. The SU group went from 34.2 per cent agreement with the SACS report to 47.3 per cent agreement when compared to the majority opinion. This represented an increase of 13.1 per cent for the SU group. The FY group went from 40.5 per cent agreement to 53.6 per cent, an increase of 13.1 per cent. The largest increase of agreement was attained by the JC group; the increase was from 32.1 per cent to 47.3 per cent, a difference of 15.2 per cent.

The respondents agree more among themselves than with the evaluators who made the actual reports to SACS. Proceeding one step further, it was determined to extract from the Reports section conditions that are in direct violation to Standard Six. These conditions were numbers three, ten and sixteen.

Condition number three stated, "The collection is not tested by checking it against bibliographies." Standard Six states, in Illustration 6, Collections: "The collections should be frequently tested against recent bibliographies and other standard guides."[1]

Condition ten stated:

> The library of a commuter college is not open 60 hours per week, but, experience has shown that the heaviest use of the library is from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M., Monday - Friday, and Saturday from 10 A.M. to 4 P.M. With no students living on campus and with an insignificant number returning at night, the library staff feels that they are giving quality service during hours that it is needed instead of diminishing the quality of service by remaining open during hours of little or no use.

Standard Six in Illustration 8, Hours Open, states: "Two and four year colleges should remain open for service a minimum of sixty hours per week, and universities eighty hours per week."[2]

---

[1] The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Standards of the College Delegate Assembly: Atlanta, 1972, p. 15.

[2] Ibid., p. 15

Finally, condition sixteen stated, "No systematic weeding has taken place within the past ten years." Again, Standard Six in Illustration 6, Collections, states, "Continuous weeding should be followed, with the advice of faculty concerned."[1]

Thus, in three distinct instances there were conditions that revealed unquestioned violations of some aspect of Standard Six. Yet, only in one group (LU, see Table 25) did the majority of respondents agree with the original SACS's reports in all three cases to report these violations as recommendations. In another group (JC) the majority of respondents agreed with the original report on condition ten only. In groups SU and FY there was no significant number that agreed with the original reports.

In the analysis of the answers of the majority of the respondents without regard to a "correct" answer (see Table 26) there was still no evidence that there was any agreement upon what constituted a violation and thereby drew a recommendation. But, the LU group responded positively, with a majority of respondents agreeing that conditions ten and sixteen required a recommendation. In the FY group the majority of respondents agreed only on condition three to require a recommendation. The SU group came close, but had only a 50 per cent agreement on condition three; it took a minimum of 51 per cent to constitute a majority. As before in the comparison with the original reports, the JC group agreed only on condition ten.

---

[1] The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Standards of the College Delegate Assembly: Atlanta, 197[illegible] p. 15.

AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT WITH THE SACS REPORTS ON CONDITIONS THREE, TEN AND SIXTEEN

		# 3	# 10	# 16
LU	Agree	7 (77.8%)	5 (55.6%)	5 (55.6%)
	Disagree	2 (22.2%)	4 (44.4%)	4 (44.4%)
	Total	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)
SU	Agree	4 (28.6%)	2 (15.4%)	4 (28.6%)
	Disagree	10 (71.4%)	11 (84.6%)	10 (71.4%)
	Total	14 (100%)	13 (100%)	14 (100%)
FY	Agree	13 (29.5%)	10 (22.7%)	20 (45.5%)
	Disagree	31 (70.5%)	34 (77.3%)	24 (54.5%)
	Total	44 (100%)	44 (100%)	44 (100%)
JC	Agree	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	4 (40%)
	Disagree	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	6 (60%)
	Total	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)

Table 25

AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT WITH THE MAJORITY OPINION ON CONDITIONS THREE, TEN AND SIXTEEN

		# 3	# 10	# 16
LU	Agree	1 (11.1%)	5 (55.6%)	5 (55.6%)
	Disagree	8 (88.9%)	4 (44.4%)	4 (44.4%)
	Total	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)
SU	Agree	7 (50%)	2 (15.4%)	4 (28.6%)
	Disagree	7 (50%)	11 (84.6%)	10 (71.4%)
	Total	14 (100%)	13 (100%)	14 (100%)
FY	Agree	24 (54.5%)	10 (22.7%)	20 (45.5%)
	Disagree	20 (45.5%)	34 (77.3%)	24 (54.5%)
	Total	44 (100%)	44 (100%)	44 (100%)
JC	Agree	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	4 (40%)
	Disagree	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	6 (60%)
	Total	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)

Table 26

After tabulating, comparing and cross-comparing the data generated by the Reports section, there is no evidence to suggest that there is any uniformity among evaluators in their treatment of conditions encountered on evaluation visits, including violations of Standard Six.

While it is conceivable that a library evaluator in an actual evaluation environment for a number of reasons ranging from sympathy with the host library's program to a personal belief that contrary to the standards, he may ignore or reduce to a more insignificant level certain findings. However, such should not be the case regarding impersonal conditions found in a section of a questionnaire. Thus, if a respondent is, in fact, aware that a condition is in violation of the standard, there is no compelling reason for him not to indicate this in a questionnaire, unless he is not aware of the content of Standard Six.

There are two conclusions concerning Reports. The first conclusion is that most evaluators cannot agree on how to categorize conditions encountered in evaluations. The second conclusion is that, with the possible exception of evaluators of large university libraries (LU), the remaining evaluators are unable to recognize blatant violations of Standard Six.

Techniques

It is not surprising to find that so many first-time evaluators considered themselves ill or moderately prepared for their initial evaluations since there is no literature available that describes the mechanics of an evaluation. Nor does SACS provide its first-time evaluators with any more literature than it provides its veteran evaluators. Therefore, it was decided that a part of the overall study be given over to gathering, and hopefully, disseminating at a later time, a list of techniques commonly utilized by library evaluators in the Southern Association accrediting region.

This segment of the questionnaire devoted to techniques will not result in an exhaustive study. One apparent weakness in this check list questionnaire, as is the case of all check list questionnaires, is that the researcher is burdened with originating almost all the possible techniques that will be placed in the survey. Since there was little material in the literature concerning evaluative techniques of library evaluators, the evaluators themselves, obvious sources of information, were asked in convenient personal conferences what techniques they used most frequently.

The literature did reveal a study done by Gelfand[1] in another accrediting region in 1958. From these two sources and personal observations of the researcher, a list of fifty-four techniques finally emerged.

It is recognized that there are over 600 institutions of higher education that comprise the total membership of SACS's Commission on Colleges. Still it was determined that there should be some significant universality among the evaluative techniques employed even in such a varied range of the institutions' libraries. Certainly there should exist some basic techniques which would have equal applicability over the entire institutional spectrum. If this is true, the vast amount of knowledge relative to techniques residing with individuals dispersed over an eleven-state geographical area should be pooled and shared with others.

The Techniques section will be analyzed in the following manner. The respondents were requested to answer by indicating whether they had utilized a technique (1) Regularly, (2) Occasionally or (3) Never. The responses to each technique inquired about will be displayed in a table depicting the percentage of responses in each category of answers. Within each category of answers there will be a further breakdown indicating whether the respondent had primarily evaluated libraries of large universities, small universities, four year colleges or junior colleges. The designations for these groups will be respectively (LU), (SU), (FY) and (JC). The responses will be displayed in percentages because of the wide disparity among the total number in each group. The responses to certain techniques have been grouped according to similarities. For example, all techniques pertaining to interviews have been displayed in one table for closer analysis.

---

[1] Morris A. Gelfand. "Techniques of library evaluators in the Middle States Association," College and Research Libraries, XIX, (July, 1958), 305-320.

Tables 27-32 represent the groupings of responses according to similarities. This group of tables is concerned with techniques employed by evaluators on their evaluation visits. Table 27, Interviews, represents the responses to inquiries about practices employed relative to interviews. Table 28, Cost Comparisons, reflects the techniques employed in comparing costs of service and library materials. Table 29, Readings, depicts the reading practices of evaluators relative to evaluations. Table 30, Physical Facilities, indicates the techniques that are employed in assessing the physical facilities of the library. Table 31, Library Staff reflects the techniques utilized by evaluators in assessing the library staff. Table 32, Miscellaneous, is a collection of unrelated techniques.

The numbers displayed in the first column of each table correspond to the numbers of the techniques listed under the Techniques section in the questionnaire, which is located in Appendix B. However, to keep the reader from having to consult the Appendix continually, the analysis of a specific table will indicate the number of the technique under discussion by identifying it within parentheses.

As is indicated in Table 27, Interviews, more than 78 per cent of the respondents regularly interview members of the Faculty Library Committee (No. 20), the teaching faculty (No. 3), the institution's administration (No. 4), the professional staff (No. 7), as well as the students (No. 5), and the library director (No. 6).

The evaluators from the LU group interview these particular individuals more often than any of the other three groups.

Evaluators are less likely to interview members of the clerical staff (No. 8), the para-professional staff (No. 7), and the president of the institution (No. 11). The person interviewed the least is the president of the student body (No. 10).

Table 28, Cost Comparisons, shows that the majority of only one group, the LU group, utilizes the technique of determining the cost of periodical binding (No. 14). No other group exceeded the 22.7 per cent recorded by the FY group. Therefore it is assumed that the majority of evaluators of all groups, with the exception of the LU group, does not determine periodical binding cost regularly.

Nor does any other group primarily concern itself with other facets of the cost of a library's operation. In none of the groups does a majority regularly determine the cost of volumes purchased (No. 15), or the cost of binding books (No. 16). Similarly, none of the groups has a majority which regularly checks the average discount rate received from the book jobbers (No. 17).

On the whole, the library evaluators of all groups are not concerned with determining what services and library materials are costing a library.

Table 29, Readings, reveals that the majority of the evaluators read similar materials in preparation for an evaluation visit. They regularly read library consultant's reports (No. 20), library annual reports (No. 21), the faculty handbook (No. 22), the library manual (No. 24) if one has been produced (No. 23), the institution's catalog (No. 25), the self-study in its entirety if the institution is small (No. 26), and selectively if the institution is large (No. 27). The LU group reads these materials in 90.3 per cent of the cases, the FY group 79.8 per cent, the SU group 73.2 per cent of the time and the JC group reads them in 72.5 per cent of the cases. Obviously a greater percentage of the LU group reads materials relative to evaluations than of the other groups.

A majority of the SU and JC groups reads the minutes of the Faculty Library Committee (No. 19). Less than a majority of the LU and FY groups utilizes this technique. Of those who examine library literature for articles describing efficient techniques for evaluating a library (No. 28), a majority of only the LU group does so. There is no majority in any group that regularly secures materials from other sources relative to the host library (No. 39).

Table 30, Physical Facilities, reveals that the LU and SU groups are not as concerned with determining whether the custodial services are adequate (No. 29) as are the FY and JC groups. Only 22.2 per cent of the LU group and 28.6 per cent of the SU group concern themselves with this technique. On the other hand, 59.1 per cent of the FY group and 70 per cent of the JC group do determine the adequacy of custodial services.

Of all the techniques concerning physical facilities only the one concerning custodial services discloses any variation among the groups. Of the remaining techniques we see that the majority, without dissent, determines the seating capacity (No. 30), the largest number of students on campus at any one time (No. 31), the adequacy of lighting (No. 32), heating (No. 33) and air conditioning (No. 33). The largest majority of the four groups who agree on the techniques is the JC group with 82.5 per cent utilizing the above techniques. Following the JC group is the FY group with 81.8 per cent, the LU group with 77.8 per cent and the SU group with 75.0 per cent utilizing the techniques.

Table 31, Library Staff, indicates that no one in the LU group corresponds with the host library director prior to the evaluation visit (No. 12). The SU group does so only 35.7 per cent of the time while the FY and JC groups correspond in only 18.2 per cent and 10 per cent of the time.

In the other nine techniques relative to the library staff there was a majority agreement on every technique within each group. Therefore it is concluded that the majority of evaluators checks the staffing schedule to determine if the availability of professional librarians is sufficient (No. 36) and checks the accessibility of professional staff to the academic community, both attitudinally and physically (No. 37). They also determine the ratio of professional staff to clerical staff (No. 40), if there are regularly scheduled staff meetings (No. 41), if the librarians have faculty status (No. 44), if the librarians who have faculty status truly have all the rights and privileges of such status (No. 45) and if the professional staff is active in professional organizations (No. 49). In addition, the majority explores the position of the library director in the institution's administrative hierarchy (No. 43) and assesses the morale of the library staff (No. 53).

The above nine techniques are employed by 93.8 per cent of the respondents in the LU group; in the SU group 83.3 per cent of the group employ them while evaluators from the FY and JC groups employ them at a rate of 82.0 per cent and 73.3 per cent respectively.

Summarizing, there were only two instances when a majority of the groups agreed, i.e., when three of the four groups' majority exceeded 50 per cent, and the dissenting majority was found in another category of "Occasionally" or "Never." In one instance the JC group's majority, 60 per cent, confers with the president of the institution (No. 11) only occasionally, while the majority of the other groups confers regularly. However, the range of differences among the three groups is only 8.7 per cent, hardly enough to be significant. In the second instance again the JC group's majority determines only occasionally if there are regularly scheduled staff meetings (No. 41). The majorities of the other groups determine this regularly. The conclusion is that there is no discernible difference in the techniques as applied by the four groups. It could be assumed therefore, that there is a body of valid evaluative techniques that is applied universally by library evaluators in a majority of instances.

Table 27
Interviews
(Percentages)

No.	REGULARLY				OCCASIONALLY				NEVER			
	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC
2.	78.	78.6	88.6	90.	22.	21.4	11.4	10.				
3.	100.	92.9	88.6	90.		7.1	11.4	10.				
4.	100.	100.	93.2	80.			6.8	20.				
5.	100.	78.6	93.2	90.		21.4	6.8	10.				
6.	100.	100.	97.7	90.			2.3	10.				
7.	100.	100.	97.7	90.			2.3	10.				
8.	55.6	64.3	56.8	50.	44.4	28.6	36.4	30.		7.1	4.5	20.
9.	55.6	64.3	56.8	60.	44.4	28.6	40.9	30.		7.1	2.3	10.
10.	11.1	35.7	13.6	10.	66.7	42.9	75.	50.	11.1		2.3	20.
11.	55.6	64.3	63.6	30.	22.2	28.6	29.5	60.	22.2	7.1	4.5	10.

Table 28

Cost Comparisons
(Percentages)

No.	REGULARLY				OCCASIONALLY				NEVER			
	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC
14.	55.6	7.1	22.7	10.	44.4	57.1	36.4	30.		35.7	40.9	60.
15.	33.3		20.5	10.	44.4	50.	40.9	20.	22.2	50.	38.6	70.
16.	11.1	7.1	13.6	10.	55.6	50.	38.6	30.	33.3	42.9	47.7	60.
17.			13.6	10.	66.7	57.1	50.	20.	33.3	42.9	36.4	70.

Table 29
Readings
(Percentages)

No.	REGULARLY				OCCASIONALLY				NEVER			
	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC
19.	44.4	57.1	47.7	70.	44.4	14.3	38.6	30.	11.1	28.6	13.6	
20.	66.7	78.6	72.7	50.	33.3	14.3	25.	40.		7.1	2.3	10.
21.	100.	71.4	79.5	80.		28.6	20.5	20.				
22.	88.9	64.3	77.3	70.	11.1	21.4	22.7	30.		14.3		
23.	88.9	57.1	81.8	70.	11.1	21.4	15.9	30.		21.4	2.3	
24.	88.9	57.1	68.2	70.	11.1	28.6	27.3	20.		14.3	4.5	10.
25.	100.	85.7	97.7	100.		14.3	2.3					
26.	88.9	92.9	95.5	90.	11.1	7.1	4.5					10.
27.	100.	78.6	65.9	50.		14.3	2.3	20.		7.1	4.5	10.
28.	55.6	28.6	38.6	50.	44.4	57.1	47.4	40.		14.3	13.6	10.
39.	22.2	28.6	22.7	30.	22.2	35.7	43.2	10.	55.6	35.7	34.1	40.

Table 30
Physical Facilities
(Percentages)

No.	REGULARLY				OCCASIONALLY				NEVER			
	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC
29.	22.2	28.6	59.1	70.	55.6	21.4	31.8	20.	22.2	35.7	6.8	10.
30.	100.	78.6	93.2	90.		21.43	6.8	10.				
31.	77.8	57.1	72.7	80.	22.2	28.6	20.5	10.		14.3	6.8	10.
32.	77.8	85.7	81.8	90.	11.1	7.1	18.2	10.	11.1	7.1		
33.	55.6	78.6	79.5	70.	33.3	14.3	20.5	30.	11.1	7.1		

Table 31
Library Staff
(Percentages)

No.	REGULARLY				OCCASIONALLY				NEVER			
	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC
12.		35.7	18.2	10.	88.9	7.1	29.5	40.	11.1	57.1	52.3	50.
36.	100.	64.3	84.1	80.		35.7	13.6	20.			2.3	
37.	100.	78.6	77.3	80.		21.4	18.2	20.			4.5	
40.	100.	78.6	86.4	80.		14.3	9.1	20.		7.1	4.5	
41.	88.9	71.4	56.8	30.	11.1	14.3	36.4	60.		14.3	6.8	10.
43.	88.9	100.	92.2	80.	11.1		6.8	10.				
44.	88.9	100.	97.7	90.			2.3		11.1			
45.	88.9	92.9	90.9	80.	11.1	7.1	9.1	10.				10.
49.	100.	78.6	65.9	60.		21.4	27.3	40.			6.8	
53.	88.9	85.7	86.4	80.	11.1	14.3	13.6	10.				10.

Table 32

Miscellaneous
(Percentages)

No.	REGULARLY				OCCASIONALLY				NEVER			
	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC	LU	SU	FY	JC
1.	66.7	50.	75.	80.	33.3	42.9	25.	20.		7.1		
13.	88.9	71.4	75.	80.	11.1	28.6	20.5	20.			4.5	
18.	77.8	92.9	90.	100.	22.2	7.1	6.8					
34.	44.4	57.1	63.6	80.	44.4	28.6	29.5	10.	11.1	14.3	6.8	10.
35.	55.6	14.3	34.1	40.	44.4	64.3	50.	10.		21.4	15.9	50.
38.	100.	92.9	90.9	90.		7.1	4.5	10.			4.5	
42.	44.4	71.4	38.6	40.	33.3	14.3	45.5	10.	22.2	14.3	15.9	50.
46.	100.	92.9	97.7	90.		7.1		10.			1.3	
47.	77.8	85.7	86.4	50.	11.1	14.3	13.6	30.	11.1			20.
48.	77.8	78.6	70.5	60.	11.1	14.3	29.5	30.	11.1	7.1		
50.	44.4	35.7	47.7	70.	44.4	57.1	38.6	30.	11.1	7.1	11.4	
51.	77.8	50.	84.1	60.	22.2	28.6	13.6	40.		21.4	2.3	
52.	66.7	71.4	72.7	60.	33.3	28.6	25.	40.				
54.	88.9	85.7	88.6	90.	11.1	14.3	9.1	10.			2.3	

EVALUATIVE TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED MORE THAN FIFTY PER CENT OF THE TIME

90 - 100%

97.4%

Interview the library director.

Interview members of the professional staff.

96.1%

Read the college/university catalogs supplied by the host institution prior to your visit.

Determine if the librarians have faculty status.

Check library hours.

93.5%

Interview members of the administration.

Read the self-study report in its entirety if the institution is small.

92.2%

Determine if the Faculty Library Committee is a policy making or advisory body.

Explore the position of the library director in the institution's administrative hierarchy.

90.9%

Interview the members of the teaching faculty.

Interview students.

Compare the percentage of the educational and general budget allocated to the library with the accepted standard stated in the A. L. A. Standards.

Check the seating capacity.

80 - 89%

89.6%

Determine if the librarians who have faculty status truly have all the rights and privileges of such status.

88.3%

Determine the library's success in achieving its goals.

85.7%

Interview the members of the Faculty Library Committee.

Determine the ratio of professional staff to clerical staff.

Assess the morale of the library staff.

83.1%

Determine the adequacy of lighting.

81.8%

Check the staffing schedule to determine if the availability of professional librarians is sufficient.

80.5%

Read the library's annual report.

Check accessibility of professional staff to the academic community.

Determine if there is an allocation formula for the distribution of the book (library materials) budget.

70 - 79%

76.6%

Check the circulation statistics.

Determine if there is an up-to-date library manual.

75.3%

Read the faculty handbook.

Determine if heating and/or air conditioning are adequate.

74.0%

Compare the library with standards from other sources such as A. L. A.

71.4%

Determine the largest number of students that are on campus at any one time.

Assuming that there are departmental budgetary allocations, determine if these allocations are being spent by the departments.

Determine if the professional staff is active in professional organizations.

70.1%

Utilize the expertise of other committee members to evaluate the sections of the library collection most familiar to them.

Read the reports made by any library consultants, if applicable.

Read the self-study report selectively if the institution is a large, multi-purpose university.

Check faculty use of the library.

60 - 69%

68.8%

Read the library manual.

62.3%

Determine if there is a continuous weeding program.

50 - 59%

59.7%

Determine if there are regularly scheduled staff meetings.

58.4%

Interview members of the sub-professional or paraprofessional staff.

Confer with the president of the institution.

57.1%

Interview members of the clerical staff.

51.9%

Read the minutes of the Faculty Library Committee.

50.6%

Determine if custodial service is adequate.

EVALUATIVE TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED LESS THAN FIFTY PER CENT OF THE TIME

40 - 49%

48.1%

Sample (spot check) titles in the card catalog for availability.

45.5%

Compare library routines with routines of other libraries.

40.3%

Examine library literature for articles describing efficient techniques for evaluating a library.

30 - 39%

33.7%

Determine if the Acquisitions Department has a desiderata file.

20 - 29%

24.7%

Secure materials from other sources relative to the host library. (Other than those supplied by the institution itself.)

Check the average cost of periodical binding.

10 - 19%

18.2%

Correspond with the host library director prior to the visit.

15.9%

Interview the president of the student body.

Check the average cost of volumes purchased.

11.7%
Check the average cost of book binding.

0 · 9%

9.1%
Check the average discount rate of volumes purchased.

The statistician who served as a consultant suggested that no test of sampling accuracy be applied to the data since the high percentage of returns precluded the existence of any sampling inaccuracies. It was also decided that since the entire population was surveyed, the high percentage of returns, in all probability, reflects an accurate representation of the population. In fact, after the study was begun and all calculations on the data were completed, several other questionnaires were returned. Though they arrived too late to be included, they were tabulated to ascertain if there were any major differences between them and the original seventy-seven returns. The conclusion was that there were no differences; therefore, it was concluded that the remaining nine questionnaires that were not returned would not significantly alter the representativeness of the population.

Benefits Derived from Evaluating Libraries

Below is the list of benefits arranged in order of decreasing frequency that reflects the benefits derived from evaluating libraries.

1. Helps to broaden one's own administrative experiences.

2. Helps me to gain a better perspective of my own library program.

3. Provides better insight into the library needs and attitudes of college and university administrators toward these needs.

4. Helps me to understand the evaluation process, thereby enabling me to prepare for my own self-study and evaluation.

5. Provides me with a better view of how the library fits into the total institution of which it is a component.

6. Helps me to improve my evaluative techniques.

7. Widens the scope of my acquaintanceship with library colleagues.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

Purpose

Ninety librarians located in the eleven-state Southern Association accrediting region were surveyed by a direct-mail questionnaire. The purpose of the survey was to collect and analyze data for two reasons. First, the data was analyzed to determine if the evaluative criteria utilized by library evaluators are based with an alternate authority or influence other than those supplied by the Southern Association. Second, the data were studied to ascertain if they would reveal certain methods, procedures and techniques employed by library evaluators which could be utilized in constructing a profile of an ideal evaluator.

A great deal of attention to the accrediting process has arisen in the past few years. This attention has resulted in mild questioning of the accreditation process in some instances to more severe criticisms attacking the very foundations of accreditation in others. Nor have the accrediting agencies themselves been exempt from criticism within their own ranks. For as the critics of accreditation increased, the accrediting agencies have introspectively turned inward, examining their own purposes and goals.

In the accrediting agency's self-examination the entire accrediting process is studied without breaking out any single segment for an intensified study. Heretofore library evaluations have been considered only in the overall context of total institutional evaluations. The intent of this study is to analyze the library evaluation segment of the institutional evaluation.

This study has been undertaken in the hope that it will result in significant findings that will improve a single aspect of accrediting, the library evaluation. While this study cannot cure all the ills that currently beset the accreditation process and since a decision cannot be made on how to improve the quality of evaluation by studying the sums of the parts of an institution, it is necessary to study the individual components. Therefore, this study focuses only on the library, but perhaps it will result in an improvement of that single aspect, which is a necessary step toward improvement of the whole.

Methodology

The population of this study consisted of ninety librarians who had performed at least one evaluation visit for SACS during the past five years. The population was identified by SACS, which along with the names of the evaluators listed the institutions where employed and names of the schools visited. In exchange for its cooperation, SACS has been offered the findings of this study to treat as it deems appropriate.

The institutions represented by the evaluators ranged throughout the spectrum of institutions of higher education, from small junior colleges to large, multi-faceted universities. Evaluations had been performed in the same institutional range. The largest representations in each instance were the librarians who were employed by and had evaluated four year colleges. This is understandable since four year colleges outnumber any other type in the Southern Association's region.

A direct-mail questionnaire was used as the data-gathering instrument. Its choice was dictated by the untenable geographical territory of eleven states through which the population was dispersed. The questionnaire was a check list questionnaire and was prepared with every consideration given the recipient. This consideration may account for the high percentage (85.56 per cent) of returns.

The research objectives which guided the collection and analysis of data were:

1. Are the evaluative criteria utilized by library evaluators based with an alternate authority or influence other than those supplied by the Southern Association?

2. Are there certain methods, procedures and techniques employed by library evaluators which could be utilized in constructing a profile of an ideal evaluator?

Findings

Each research objective is stated, followed by the summary of findings for that objective.

Research Objective 1.

To determine if the evaluative criteria utilized by library evaluators are based with an alternate authority or influence other than those supplied by the Southern Association.

It is evident that the evaluators consider themselves self-sufficient and competent to evaluate libraries without maintaining strict adherence to SACS's Standard Six. The implication is that the libraries are so varied it is difficult to apply the standard absolutely in each case. Therefore, SACS's standard is used primarily as a point of departure to perform an evaluation that is tailored more to the concepts and training of the individual evaluator.

A large majority of the evaluators indicated that they believe their task is to evaluate the library rather than the library's self-study. This is a contradiction of the charge to the visiting committee in the Manual for the Institutional Self-Study Program of the Commission on Colleges.

The evaluators think there is a need for better guidance from SACS in the form of quantitative guidelines, check lists and/or questionnaires. They also think that they should be released from the subjectivity inherent in a program that requires one standard to measure such a myriad of libraries. However, evaluators do not think that Standard Six is unenforceable just because it does not contain normative guidelines. In lieu of normative guidelines emanating from SACS, evaluators rely on alternate sources for quantitative guidelines such as those found in the A. L. A. standards, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Clapp/Jordan formula.

Also, we have seen that the majority of respondents have devised their own check lists and questionnaires which they use on evaluations. The fact that so many have deemed it necessary to fashion their own check lists and questionnaires is conclusive evidence that it was done specifically to serve an unfulfilled need.

A preponderance of the respondents find the information supplied by SACS helpful in library evaluations. If the meager materials supplied by SACS are considered helpful, then it is assumed that additional materials such as quantitative guidelines would also be helpful.

Ironically evaluators would like to receive feedback from SACS relative to their reports. They agree that such information would probably be very useful in performing evaluations. Yet only five evaluators have received any feedback from SACS. The irony lies in the fact that evaluators want feedback, they agree feedback would be useful, and they are willing to generate input to SACS relative to library evaluations, but SACS has never generated input to the evaluators nor has it ever asked for feedback from the evaluators. It is clearly indicated that the library evaluators, in the majority of cases, and SACS are not communicating with each other. Evidently SACS is under the impression that it does not need any input from the people who are actually performing the evaluations, or it does not have the time to bridge what could prove to be a fruitful gap.

It has been revealed that library evaluators have no acceptable degree of uniformity or consistency in their reporting techniques. Even in obvious instances of blatant violations of Standard Six, the majority of evaluators were unable to recognize them. If such obvious conditions cannot be recognized surely more subtle violations must go unnoticed also. In viewing the evaluators as a group, it is evident that the majority cannot agree not even at a 50 per cent level on how to report conditions encountered on an evaluation.

Returning to the first research objective, the evaluative criteria utilized by library evaluators are based in alternate authorities in lieu of SACS's criteria, lack of criteria or the failure to recognize SACS's criteria. The Southern Association has only a small amount of influence on its evaluators. The evaluators are self-sufficient and rely on their own resources, and backgrounds of educational training and library experience to evaluate libraries. The disregard for Standard Six is remarkable. The standard is used for a point of departure--a reason for employing evaluative techniques that are based in the individual evaluator's background. The influence exercised upon the evaluator by SACS is minimal.

Research Objective 2.

To determine if there are certain methods, procedures and techniques employed by library evaluators which could be utilized in constructing a profile of an ideal evaluator.

In attempting to construct the profile of an ideal evaluator, it is not implied that the profile resulting from this particular study is generalizable to any other evaluators. Nor does it intend to imply that adoption of such opinions, procedures and techniques exhibited by the evaluators' profile would result in better evaluations by any one individual. The profile appearing below reflects the opinions of the majority of the evaluators responding to the survey. It could be assumed that an evaluator desiring to acquire knowledge of evaluation techniques as they are implemented in SACS's accrediting region could profit from conforming to the profile, in the instances where knowledge of others' experience is beneficial.

The characteristics of the average evaluator are that he is employed by a four year college and has performed most of his evaluations in four year college libraries during 1970, 1971, and 1972. Although his first evaluation visit found him ill or moderately prepared for such a task, he has performed 3.8 evaluations for SACS. He has never received any training from SACS relative to evaluation techniques which probably accounts for a feeling of mild inadequacy during his first evaluation. As a solution to poor preparation for the first visit, he thinks that an evaluator-to-be should serve on one evaluation as an observer.

He is not aware of any criteria that must be met in order to be chosen as an evaluator. As an evaluator he works alone, in fact, he usually is the sole member of the committee assigned to the library. However, he is requested to evaluate other aspects of an institution while serving as the library evaluator. In these cases he is more likely to be working with two or more committee members. On balance he feels qualified to perform evaluations in other areas.

The composite evaluator prepares a check list of items to investigate and he prepares a questionnaire to guide his interviews while evaluating. He thinks that such questionnaires and check lists are important and helpful, but, he thinks they could become more meaningful if they were produced and distributed by SACS. He thinks that the material presently distributed by SACS is useful.

SACS does not present any feedback to the evaluator so he never knows how he measures up against other evaluators. He is willing to share his concepts and techniques with SACS but there are no channels of communication available for dialogue between the two.

Evaluators are paid an honorarium of $50.00 plus expenses for working as an evaluator; this is a token payment but it is perfectly acceptable to the evaluator. He considers other benefits derived from evaluating more important than the amount of the monetary gain.

The evaluator is more concerned with the educational effectiveness of the library than he is with the operational efficiency. In deciding upon whether a library is effective educationally, the evaluator attempts to determine the adequacy of the book collection. He does this primarily by interviewing library staff, faculty and students to establish their success-failure ratio in locating the materials needed by them. He would like to see a valid sampling technique developed that would enable him to measure a collection's adequacy more precisely than interviewing allows. The two and a half days allowed for a visit are adequate but collection sampling would save valuable time while being more precise.

Our evaluator visits the library at night to observe library use, to interview library users, to determine if the lighting is adequate and to observe availability of personnel.

On many occasions the evaluator will use his authority to aid the host library's program. He often acts in a friendly and sympathetic manner in aiding the library administration to gain consideration on some long-neglected proposal. Before leaving the campus, the evaluator usually apprises the host library director of his findings.

Below is a list of the most widely employed techniques in decreasing order of frequency:

1. Interview the library director.
2. Interview members of the professional staff.
3. Read the college/university catalogs supplied by the host institution prior to your visit.
4. Determine if the librarians have faculty status.
5. Check library hours.
6. Interview members of the administration.
7. Read the self-study report in its entirety if the institution is small.
8. Determine if the Faculty Library Committee is a policy making or advisory body.
9. Explore the position of the library director in the institution's administrative hierarchy.
10. Interview the members of the teaching faculty.

11. Interview students.

12. Compare the percentage of the educational and general budget allocated to the library with the accepted standard stated in the A. L. A. Standards.

13. Check the seating capacity.

14. Determine if the librarians who have faculty status truly have all the rights and privileges of such status.

15. Determine the library's success in achieving its goals.

16. Interview the members of the Faculty Library Committee.

17. Determine the ratio of professional staff to clerical staff.

18. Assess the morale of the library staff.

19. Determine the adequacy of lighting.

20. Check the staffing schedule to determine if the availability of professional librarians is sufficient.

21. Read the library's annual report.

22. Check the accessibility of professional staff to the academic community.

23. Determine if there is an allocation formula for the distribution of the book (library materials) budget.

24. Check the circulation statistics.

25. Determine if there is an up-to-date library manual.

26. Read the faculty handbook.

27. Determine if heating and/or air conditioning are adequate.

Research objective two was met; there are certain methods, procedures and techniques employed by library evaluators that were utilized in constructing a profile of the average or ideal evaluator.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. There is a minimum amount of guidance given to library evaluators.

2. Communications between SACS and the library evaluators are at an insignificant level. The evaluators need and desire a downward flow of information from SACS relative to their role as perceived by SACS.

3. Library evaluators have adjusted to the lack of guidance from SACS and have devised check lists and questionnaires as personal evaluating tools. They are to be commended for their admirable professional acceptance and discharge of their evaluation duties. With no centralized supervision, evaluators exhibit a remarkable similarity in the techniques they utilize in the evaluation process. However, in the area of reports made to SACS, the lack of uniformity and consistency is apparent. This is a fault that could easily be remedied, but the solution lies with SACS and not

the evaluating personnel.

4. It is recommended that SACS should produce and distribute publications to its evaluators emphasizing and identifying the differences between suggestions and recommendations.

5. In view of the facts, it is evident that the connection between SACS and its evaluators is, at best, tenuous. It seems as if the evaluators are chosen and assigned to evaluation teams with no instruction as to how they are to function. In short, library evaluations are performed by librarians who bring to the task only their own opinions, attitudes, skills, training, experiences and techniques. The evaluations are performed in a vacuum as it were.

6. It is recommended that for first-time evaluators, SACS should, in lieu of more beneficial training, give the evaluators copies of what it considers to be good examples of past reports. To be more meaningful the reports should be from institutions possessing similar characteristics as the one to which the evaluator is assigned.

7. Library evaluators are interested in performing evaluations as attested to by their repeated acceptances of assignments. These assignments are accepted out of a sense of duty to their profession and the benefits derived are more important than any

remuneration.

8. The libraries hosting an evaluation visit are subjugated to what perhaps could be labeled as an undue degree of subjectivity on the part of the evaluator. If the purpose of SACS is to expose libraries to subjective evaluations by library evaluators operating within their own frame of references, then there is no argument. However, if this is not SACS's purpose, then it should communicate its desired objectives, goals, techniques and purpose to those who are performing the evaluations. For any accreditation process that lends itself so readily to massive subjectivity, cannot be a very reliable one. If the process of library evaluation is to improve, a balanced perspective must be sought.

9. It is recommended that SACS not assign library evaluators to evaluate other aspects of an institution because of the one in three chance of placing an evaluator in a role that he is unqualified to fulfill. Institutions whose vitality hinges upon accreditation certainly are put in an untenable position when a single evaluator is not competent.

10. Standard Six is too ambiguous, indefinite and unquantified to serve as an effective measuring device of the adequacy of a library. This is especially true in light of the fact that one standard

is applied to more than several hundred libraries. It is not desirable to have a rigid, inflexible standard similar to the historical precedents. A modern, flexible standard that contains normative data along with quantitative guidelines that could be applied to types and categories of libraries might be acceptable. For example, data could be collected from all libraries in the Southern Association and divided and grouped according to purpose, goals, size of student body, size of faculty, holdings in the library, budget, etc. Then norms could be established and libraries measured against them. The norms could be expressed in a range of percentages thereby allowing flexibility.

11. The evaluators who primarily evaluate libraries of large universities (LU) are more cognizant of conditions that reflect violations of Standard Six than are evaluators who mostly evaluate small university (SU), four year college (FY), and junior college (JC) libraries.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. A study be undertaken, similar to the present one, of the library evaluators who are primarily employed by and perform evaluations primarily in junior colleges.

2. Perception of library evaluators by librarians of the host institution be studied.

3. A study similar to the present one be done in a regional accrediting agency other than the Southern Association and comparisons drawn.

4. A study, perhaps utilizing the Delphi technique, be executed to intensify the focus upon and to measure more precisely the techniques employed by library evaluators in the Southern Association. Once a series of valid, beneficial techniques has been produced they should be disseminated to evaluators.

5. A study be made to determine how many institutions are denied accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation because of deficiencies in the library. Results derived from such a study could then be correlated to other standards and to the library evaluators themselves in order to ascertain any significance.

6. An in-depth study be made of library evaluators to ascertain if there are, in fact, certain groups of evaluators who are more competent than others. It would be interesting and beneficial to be able to identify the characteristics possessed by better than average evaluators.

APPENDIX A

LETTER SENT TO LIBRARY EVALUATORS

STETSON UNIVERSITY
DELAND, FLORIDA
32720

DUPONT-BALL LIBRARY

APPENDIX A

LETTER SENT TO LIBRARY EVALUATORS

As one of a group of approximately 200 librarians located throughout an eleven state area, you possess unique information about library evaluations that is not generally available to thousands of other librarians. In an effort to garner such data, and ultimately, to disseminate this information, a questionnaire has been prepared to serve as a data-gathering instrument.

While this questionnaire may appear to be quite lengthy, it actually takes only minutes to check the answers. If you would be so kind as to fill in the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me, I would be most appreciative. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

The Southern Association has supplied me with your name and they are aware of this study. A copy of this questionnaire has been sent to the Associate Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges.

I plan to use the data in my doctoral dissertation that I am currently working on for the School of Library Science at Florida State University. Also, the analysis and conclusions of this study will be made available to everyone who participates in the study. The purpose of the study is to pool the expertise possessed by a minority of librarians and make it available to present and future library evaluators, as well as librarians who will be undergoing an evaluation visit.

The sharing of your thoughts, opinions and evaluative techniques should strengthen the overall effectiveness of library evaluations, while at the same time, remove some of the uncertainty professed by librarians who host the evaluation visits.

Your time is valuable, I realize. However, you are a member of an informal group whose total number is but a small percentage of the total number of librarians in the Southeastern United States. This fact makes your opinions especially valuable and significant. So, won't you please take the time to read the statements and simply check the answers. Anonymity is assured. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dudley Yates

Dudley Yates
Doctoral Candidate

John M. Goudeau

Dr. John M. Goudeau
Major Professor
School of Library Science
Florida State University

DY:dky
Enclosure

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO LIBRARY EVALUATORS

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BASES USED BY LIBRARY EVALUATORS IN THE ACCREDITING PROCESS OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS -- A QUESTIONNAIRE

PURPOSE:

This questionnaire is designed to generate data which can be analyzed to determine the priority of the bases utilized in library evaluations. Secondly, the study is designed to allow input of the specialized knowledge possessed by library evaluators. Such specialized data could be useful to present and future evaluators, as well as librarians who host a committee visit. Thirdly, another purpose is to bring into focus that facet of librarianship that is a pervading influence of vital importance to the profession but heretofore not widely known or understood.

DESIGN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

The questionnaire is divided as follows:

I. Background Information

II. General Information

III. Reports

IV. Techniques

V. Benefits Derived from Evaluating Libraries

VI. Comments

To conserve as much of your time as possible, the questions in almost every instance may be answered with a check ✓. However, please feel free to make an appropriate comment at any point in the questionnaire. In fact, the researcher values highly such comments but in the interest of convenience, which insures a higher percentage of returns, it will suffice only to check the answers. An additional sheet has been attached if you desire to use it for comments.

DEFINITIONS:

SACS. The acronym SACS should be read as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges.

STANDARD SIX. Standard Six refers to that segment of the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools which pertains to libraries.

SUGGESTION. A suggestion is merely a helpful hint made to the host institution that carries no basis in authority.

RECOMMENDATION. A recommendation is one that cannot be ignored by the host institution; it has to be answered with an explanation as to why it cannot be implemented or it must be implemented.

BACKGROUND

1. Most of my experience as a librarian has been in Junior colleges____ Four year colleges____ Small universities up to 7,500 students____ Large universities____ Special library____ Teaching____
2. The majority of my evaluations have been in Junior colleges____ Four year colleges____ Small universities____ Large universities____
3. Number of evaluations performed during the past five years (approximately)
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ More than 5____
4. I have performed evaluations in the following years 1972____ 1971____ 1970____ 1969____ 1968____
5. Have you ever worked as an evaluator with one or more additional library evaluators? Yes____ No____
   If yes, what was the total number of library evaluators? 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ More than 5____
6. Do you know of any criteria that must be met in order to become an evaluator? Yes____ No____
7. How would you describe your thoughts on preparation for your very first evaluation visit?
   I was ill-prepared____ I was moderately prepared____
   I was well prepared____ I had excellent preparation____
8. Do you benefit professionally from serving as a visiting library evaluator? Yes____ No____ No opinion____

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. It is admirable that SACS relies on qualitative and individual approaches to a library evaluation rather than an approach based upon strict adherence to Standard Six.
   Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____
2. It is possible to evaluate a library's collection and staff in a visit of two to three days duration.
   Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

GENERAL INFORMATION (continued)

3. Standard Six attempts to cover all types of academic libraries, private, public, denominational, junior colleges, commuter colleges, small universities, and large universities. Standards should be written to take into account such obvious differences among such varied institutional libraries.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

4. A library evaluator often acts as a catalyst to speed up a segment of the host library's program by using the leverage inherent in the authority of the accrediting agency.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

5. There are absolutely no library standards in the United States applicable to university libraries.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

6. Apparently, the process leading to accreditation is of immense benefit to the library of the institution concerned.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

7. The evaluating tools presently employed by librarians to measure the adequacy of collections are either too costly in time, which is money, or they measure imperfectly. A possible solution, which would be of benefit to library evaluators, would be to apply the sampling technique to measure the adequacy of collections.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

8. As a library evaluator, you are more concerned with the educational effectiveness of the library rather than its operational efficiency.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

9. In view of the fact that each individual library should be examined or evaluated with an eye toward the parent institution's goals, purposes, curriculum and faculty, would you agree that SACS's Standard Six is at best a point of departure for an evaluation that is based more in the individual evaluator's background of experience and professional training than in the standards themselves.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

10. It would helpan inexperienced evaluator to observe at least one evaluation before being assigned to a visiting evaluation committee.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

11. Libraries of large, well established institutions which are not dependent upon accreditation (they have an unquestioned reputation for academic excellence) derive their sole benefits from the total review and focusing of effort which is provided in the self-study.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

12. Evaluators need better guidance in the form of quantitative guidelines, check lists, and/or questionnaires.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

13. When SACS revises Standard Six, a statement requiring institutions to grant full faculty status to professional librarians should be included.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

14. Due to the fact that suggestions made by the library evaluator may be ignored entirely, it would be proper to eliminate them from the report and rely solely upon recommendations.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

15. The truly important work has been accomplished through the institution's self-study.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

16. The role of the evaluator is to react to and evaluate the library's self-study, not the library.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

17. The most important facet of the evaluative process is that it compels the library to consider the very reasons for its existence. Thus, the evaluative process will aid in bringing the library's purposes clearly into line with the overall objectives of the institution of which it is a part.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

18. Other members of an evaluation team sometimes do not completely understand the library evaluator's point of view.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

19. Library evaluators, and other evaluators for that matter, are said to be poorly paid consultants.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

20. A library evaluator should be a member of each visiting evaluation team.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

21. Standard Six is, in fact, unenforceable because it does not contain adequate normative data to guide the library evaluator.
Strongly agree____ Slightly agree____ No opinion____ Slightly disagree____ Strongly disagree____

GENERAL INFORMATION
Section B

1. Would it be advisable for SACS to be more specific about the library committee? (Standard Six now states in regard to the library committee, "There should be a proper academic committee concerned for the library which should include the librarian.")
Yes____ No____ No opinion____

2. Have you ever served on a visiting committee that failed to accredit/re-accredit an institution because of deficiencies in the library?
Yes____ No____

3. Have you ever served on a visiting committee that failed to accredit/re-accredit an institution because of any reason?
Yes____ No____ Don't know____

GENERAL INFORMATION Section B (continued)

4. The honorarium fee ($50.00) paid to library evaluators should be:
Kept the same____ Eliminated____ Increased to $____ Decreased to $____ The fee is unimportant____

5. Do you think that any new library standards would be more helpful if they were to be written more from the viewpoint of the library user?
Yes____ No____ No opinion____

6. Should SACS introduce some quantitative standards into Standard Six?
Yes____ No____ No opinion____

7. Do you find the information supplied by SACS helpful in library evaluations?
Yes____ No____ No opinion____

8. Have you ever been requested to evaluate any other aspect of an institution while serving as the library evaluator?
Yes____ No____
If yes, go to (a) and (b).

(a) Please identify the area of the additional evaluation. ________________________________

(b) Do you think your qualifications enabled you to make an efficient and effective evaluation of this additional assignment?
Yes____ No____

9. Do you visit the library at night to: Observe library use____ To interview library users____
To determine if the lighting is adequate____ To observe availability of personnel____ Never visit the library at night____

10. Do you have your own checklist of items to observe during an evaluation?
Yes____ No____

11. Do you have your own list of questions to ask interviewees?
Yes____ No____

12. Are you aware that SACS has now initiated a long-term study to revise its library standard? (Standard Six).
Yes____ No____

13. A checklist or questionnaire prepared by SACS would be helpful as an evaluative tool.
Yes____ No____ No opinion____

14. How do you determine the adequacy of the library collection? Standard Six states "The book and periodical collection should, by quality, size and nature, support and stimulate the entire educational program."

Make extensive checks of the collection against standard bibliographies____.

Interview library staff, faculty and students to ascertain their success or failure in finding the materials needed by them____.

Spot check titles against bibliographies____.

Compare the numerical total of the collection with some quantitative standard such as given by H. E. W., A. L. A., or the Clapp/Jordan formula____.

Assume that if the collection were inadequate and unable to "support and stimulate the entire educational program" it would so state in the library self-study____.

15. Has SACS ever requested you to generate feedback for the purpose of improving evaluative techniques?
Yes____ No____
If answer to above was yes, did you cooperate and submit any input? Yes____ No____

16. Do you usually apprise the library director of your findings before leaving?
Yes____ No____

17. Feedback from SACS would help you to perform evaluations more effectively and efficiently.
Yes____ No____ No opinion____

18. Have you ever received any feedback from SACS relative to your reports?
Yes____ No____
If answer to above was yes, has this feedback been: Helpful____ Non-helpful____ Positive____ Negative____
Constructive____ Official____ Informal____
(Check all that are applicable)

19. Have you ever attempted to aid a library to gain favorable administrative consideration for a long-neglected item through your influence as a library evaluator?
Yes____ No____ Do not know____

20. Have you ever received any training from SACS on: Proper evaluative techniques____ Report writing____

21. Have you been invited to supply any input into SACS's revision of the library standards? (Standard Six).
Yes____ No____
Would you participate if asked? Yes____ No____
What recommendations would you suggest, that, in your opinion, would help improve library evaluations. (Please use comment sheet if additional space is needed.)

REPORTS

Assuming that you would encounter the conditions listed below, would you as a library evaluator:

(1) include a statement describing the condition in the text of your report but with no specific suggestion or recommendation.

(2) include the condition in the category of Suggestions.

(3) include the condition in the category of Recommendations.

(4) not report it at all.

1. The library collection, in your opinion, is not sufficient to support the informational needs of the institution.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

2. Librarians are paid significantly lower than teaching faculty with the same rank.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

3. The collection is not tested by checking it against bibliographies.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

4. The library administration continues to hire professional librarians without regard to whether they graduated from an A. L. A. accredited library school or not.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

5. The library director is not a member of the Graduate Council.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

6. Communications among the librarians are not sufficient due to irregular and widely spaced staff meetings.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

7. The library only has stairs connecting the other floors, no elevators or book lifts.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

8. The library closes from 5 P. M. to 7 P. M. each day because experience has indicated this to be the time of lowest usage. The staff thinks that it is best to close and conserve staff time for periods of heavier use.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

9. The library purchases books only and will not provide non-book materials.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

10. The library of a commuter college is not open 60 hours per week, but, experience has shown that the heaviest use of the library is from 8 A. M. to 5 P. M., Monday - Friday and Saturday from 10 A. M. to 4 P. M. With no students living on campus and with an insignificant number returning at night, the library staff feels that it is giving quality service during hours that it is needed instead of diminishing the quality of service by remaining open during hours of little or no use.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

11. The library does not have representation on the Curriculum Development Committee that would enable it to anticipate and meet instructional and research needs.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

12. The major portions of the majority of the library departmental budget allocations are consistently returned to the library's General Fund unexpended.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

13. The Faculty Library Committee is a policy making body which utilizes the library director to implement its decisions.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

14. Instructional departments, for the most part, are inactive in recommending library materials for purchase.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

15. The library falls below the A. L. A. standard of receiving a minimum of 5% of the total Educational and General budget.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

16. No systematic weeding has taken place within the past ten years.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

17. The total number of volumes does not match the number suggested by the Clapp/Jordan formula for an institution of its size and curriculum.
Text____ Suggestion____ Recommendation____ Not at all____

TECHNIQUES

Please answer the following by checking one of the three choices. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

1. Utilize the expertise of other committee members to evaluate the sections of the library collection most familiar to them.
Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

2. Interview the members of the Faculty Library Committee. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

3. Interview the members of the teaching faculty. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

4. Interview members of the administration. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

TECHNIQUES (continued)

5. Interview students. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
6. Interview the library director. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
7. Interview members of the professional staff. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
8. Interview members of the clerical staff. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
9. Interview members of the sub-professional or para-professional staff. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
10. Interview the president of the student body. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
11. Confer with the president of the institution. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
12. Correspond with the host library director prior to the visit. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
13. Check the circulation statistics. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
14. Check the average cost of periodical binding. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
15. Check the average cost of volumes purchased. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
16. Check the average cost of book binding. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
17. Check the average discount rate of volumes purchased. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
18. Compare the percentage of the educational and general budget allocated to the library with the accepted standard stated in A. L. A. standards. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
19. Read the minutes of the Faculty Library Committee. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
20. Read the reports made by any library consultants, if applicable. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
21. Read the library's annual report. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
22. Read the faculty handbook. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
23. Determine if there is an up-to-date library manual. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
24. Read the library manual. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
25. Read the college/university catalogs supplied by the host institution prior to your visit. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
26. Read the self-study report in its entirety if the institution is small. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
27. Read the self-study report selectively if the institution is a large, multi-purpose university. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
28. Examine library literature for articles describing efficient techniques for evaluating a library. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
29. Determine if custodial service is adequate. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
30. Check the seating capacity. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
31. Determine the largest number of students that are on campus at any one time. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
32. Determine the adequacy of lighting. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
33. Determine if heating and/or air conditioning are adequate. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
34. Determine if there is a continuous weeding program. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
35. Determine if the Acquisitions Department has a desiderata file. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
36. Check the staffing schedule to determine if the availability of professional librarians is sufficient. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
37. Check accessibility of professional staff to the academic community. (Attitudinally and physical accessibility.) Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
38. Determine if the Faculty Library Committee is a policy making or advisory body. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
39. Secure materials from other sources relative to the host library. (Other than those supplied by the institution itself.) Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
40. Determine the ratio of professional staff to clerical staff. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____
41. Determine if there are regularly scheduled staff meetings. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

TECHNIQUES (continued)

42. Compare library routines with routines of other libraries. (Circulation routines and mail-handling routines as examples.)
Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

43. Explore the position of the library director in the institution's administrative hierarchy.
Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

44. Determine if the librarians have faculty status. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

45. Determine if the librarians who have faculty status truly have all the rights and privileges of such status.
Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

46. Check library hours. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

47. Determine if there is an allocation formula for the distribution of the book (library materials) budget.
Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

48. Assuming that there are departmental budgetary allocations, determine if these allocations are being spent by the departments.
Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

49. Determine if the professional staff is active in professional organizations.
Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

50. Sample (spot check) titles in the card catalog for availability. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

51. Compare the library with standards from other sources, such as A. L. A.
Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

52. Check faculty use of the library. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

53. Assess the morale of the library staff. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

54. Determine the library's success in achieving its goals. Regularly____ Occasionally____ Never____

BENEFITS DERIVED FROM EVALUATING LIBRARIES

Check all that are applicable.

1. Helps me to understand the evaluation process, thereby enabling me to prepare for my own self-study and evaluation. ____
2. Helps me to gain a better perspective of my own library program. ____
3. Helps me to improve my evaluative techniques. ____
4. Widens the scope of my acquaintanceship with library colleagues. ____
5. Helps to broaden one's own administrative experiences. ____
6. Provides better insight into the library needs, and attitudes of college and university administrators toward these needs. ____
7. Provides me with a better view of how the library fits into the total institution of which it is a component. ____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Blauch, Lloyd E. (ed.) *Accreditation in higher education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1959.

Selden, William K. *Accreditation: a struggle over standards in higher education.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. *Manual for the Institutional Self-Study Program of the Commission on Colleges.* 1972.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. *The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools*: Atlanta, n.d.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. *Standards of the College Delegate Assembly*. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972.

Wiggins, Sam P. *Higher education in the South.* Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1966.

Articles

Axt, Richard G. "The accrediting agencies and the regional educational compacts," *Journal of Higher Education,* XXXI n. 6, (June, 1960), 306-312.

"Basic policies for accreditation," *Educational Record,* LIII, n. 2, (Spring, 1972), 149-156.

Benjamin, Curtis G. "Who will save the scholarly book?" The American Scholar, XXXXI, n. 2, (Spring, 1972), 212-221.

Burns, Norman. "Accrediting procedures with special reference to libraries," College and Research Libraries, X, n. 2, (April, 1949), 155-158.

______. "The task of accrediting in higher education today," North Central Association Quarterly, XXXIV, n. 1, (July, 1959), 220-225.

Dickey, Frank G. and Miller, Jerry W. "Federal involvement in nongovernmental accreditation," Educational Record, LIII, n. 2, (Spring, 1972), 128-142.

Dressel, Paul L. "Accreditation and institutional self-study," North Central Association Quarterly, XXXXVI, n. 1, (Fall, 1971), 177-287.

______. "Some observations on NCA examiner's reports," North Central Association Quarterly, XXXXII, (Fall, 1967), 214-219.

Eckelberry, Roscoe H. "Accreditation in a pluralistic society," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, (June, 1960), 344-345.

______. "Accrediting in higher education: a symposium," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, (June, 1960), 295-296.

Gelfand, Morris A. "Techniques of library evaluators in the Middle States Association," College and Research Libraries, XIX, (July, 1958), 305-320.

Hurt, Peyton. "Principles and standards for surveying a college library," College and Research Libraries, II, (March, 1941), 110-116.

Kells, Herbert R. "Institutional accreditation: new forms of self-study," Educational Record, LIII, n. 2. (Spring, 1972), 143-148.

Koerner, James D. "Preserving the status quo: academia's hidden cartel," Change, III, (March-April), 50-54.

Knowles, Asa S. "A report on institutional accreditation in higher education," North Central Association Quarterly, XXXXV, (Fall, 1970), 279-291.

Mills, Henry C. "The effects of accreditation procedures," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, n. 6, (June, 1960), 312-316.

Pattillo, Manning M. "Accreditation as a protection against pressures," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, n. 6, (June, 1960), 301-306.

______. "The appraisal of junior college and college libraries," College and Research Libraries, XVII, (September, 1956), 397-402.

Pfnister, Allan O. "Regional accrediting agencies at the crossroads," Journal of Higher Education, XXXXII, (October, 1971), 558-573.

Robb, Felix C. "Annual report of the director," Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Proceedings, (July, 1971), 1-6.

Russell, John Dale. "The accrediting of institutions of higher education," Journal of Teacher Education, I, (June, 1950), 83-93.

See, Harold W. "Send it to the president," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVIII (January, 1957), 129-131.

Selden, William K. "A new translation of an old testament," Educational Record, XXXXIX, (Winter, 1968), 109-115.

______. "The place of accreditation in the governance of higher education," Journal of Teacher Education, XV, (September, 1964), 262-268.

Selden, William K. "Why accreditation," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, n. 6, (June, 1960), 296-301.

Stallman, Esther. "Accreditation," Drexel Library Quarterly, III, (April, 1967), 185-195.

Stuit, Dewey B. "Accreditation--its problems and its future," Teachers College Record, LXII, (May, 1961), 629-641.

______. "Improved methods of accrediting," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, n. 6, (June, 1960), 317-322.

Wiley, Mary Glenn and Zald, Mayer N. "The growth and transformation of educational accrediting agencies: an exploratory study in social control of institutions," Sociology of Education, XXXXI, (Winter, 1968), 36-56.

Wriston, Henry M. "The futility of accrediting," Journal of Higher Education, XXXI, n. 6, (June, 1960), 327-329.

Dissertations

Covey, Alan Dale. "Evaluation of college libraries for accreditation purposes." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.

Gelfand, Morris A. "Historical study of the evaluation of libraries in higher institutions by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, New York University, 1960.

VITA

Dudley Vernon Yates
Born October 31, 1932, in Henleyfield, Mississippi

Education

1961	Bachelor of Arts in English, Northeast Louisiana University, Monroe, Louisiana.
1963	Master of Science in Library Science, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
1967	Master of Arts in Anthropology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
1972	Advanced Master of Science in Library Science, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.
1973	Doctor of Philosophy in Library Science, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

Library Experience

1963-1964	Public Services Librarian, Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa.
1964-1965	Assistant Reference Librarian, The University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana.
1965-1966	Head Reference Librarian and Head, Circulation Department, The University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana.

1966-1968	Assistant Director, The University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana.
1968-	Director. Stetson University, Deland, Florida.

Teaching Experience

1966-1968	Library Orientation and Advanced Bibliography, The University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana.
1968-1973	Library Administration I, Library Administration II, and Reference Materials, Department of Education, Stetson University, Deland, Florida.